

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, May, 1888.

MACAULAY AND CARLYLE.

PROF. MCELROY's paper on "Matter and Manner," in MOD. LANG. NOTES for February, is in need of rectification at several points.

So far as the personal element may enter into the following remarks, the reader must suffer me to be as brief as will comport with clearness and explicitness.

1. When PROF. MCELROY asserts, column 57, that "both [PROF. HART and PROF. HUNT] ignored, as it seems to me, this fundamental principal of the inseparability, except in thought, of matter and form in literary composition, both spoke as if the only merit in composition were its expressing worthy thought," he is in grievous error, so far at least as I am concerned. Neither at Philadelphia nor elsewhere, neither verbally nor in print, have I ever expressed or intimated any other belief than that style and thought are inseparable, that poor style proceeds from poor thinking, that good style consists in the adequate adjustment of thought and expression. For others I do not undertake to speak.

2. The quotation ascribed to me in the same place, viz.: "MACAULAY always seemed to write as if some one were looking over his shoulder and saying 'Bravo! LORD MACAULAY; how well you have turned out that sentence,'" is true as far as given. But being given only in part, the truth is only partial; and sometimes, be the reader admonished, partial truth is partial error. PROF. MCELROY should have remembered the steps that led up to my conclusion. But they will be given farther on; provisionally let me note another passage from PROF. MCELROY, column 59: "But he [the critic] is manifestly unfair when he . . . holds the writer up to ridicule as posing before a looking-glass and saying: 'Ah, you handsome dog,' when in fact, though the writer is a bit self-conscious, he really gives us something fine to look at.'" Is writing "as if some one were looking over your shoulder"="posing before a looking-glass"? Is catching applause from *another*,

"Bravo, how well *you* have done that"= saying to *oneself* "What a handsome dog am *I*"? The reader must decide whether he believes the present writer capable of thus mistaking MACAULAY for, let us say, BULWER.

3. PROF. MCELROY puts the broad question, column 58: "Is there no merit in a fine style? Is such a style necessarily bad? Are we to attend only to the thought of a composition?" The sound critic will unhesitatingly reply: There is *every* merit in a fine style, only let us first determine what makes style *truly fine*. PROF. MCELROY has evidently failed to perceive what should be a patent fact, to wit, that while some would-be critics may sneer at MACAULAY for writing too finely, there are other critics who object to him because *he does not write finely enough!* The present writer belongs to the latter class, and it will be the aim of the following remarks to justify his position.

1. Wherein consists the essence of style? What gives a writer his individuality? PROF. MCELROY touches forcibly, columns 61 and 62, upon one of the evils of our time, viz.: the gross neglect of rhetoric and criticism, the thrusting aside of literature in favor of philology. It is only too true, as he intimates, that our college students are left to acquire a good style by "absorption;" that "questions of grammatical purity are treated as of little value, and, with the weightier matters of sentence and paragraph building, unity of composition, clearness, force, and other such topics, are hustled out of court in quiet contempt." This is all true, painfully true. Yet it does not go to the root of the evil, nor does the professor, it is to be feared, even see the root of the evil. Else he would not think and write of MACAULAY as he does.

The secret of style lies in the infallible use of words. Whether a writer be great or only mediocre, will depend first and last upon his choice of words. Grammar, paragraphing, unity of composition, even clearness and force, are things that can be taught. All, except perhaps force, should indeed be disposed of in the grammar school. But precision, propriety, elegance, incisiveness, suggestiveness, in-

dividuality, how and when are they to be acquired? How, indeed, if not through the closest study of the greatest writers in their happiest moods? As regards MACAULAY, his genuine critics maintain that he is not one of the greatest writers of our language, and that he does not repay the closest study, because he is lacking in the *curiosa felicitas* which betokens consummate literary genius.

Text-books of rhetoric, and with them instruction in rhetoric, overlook the paramount importance of the word-element in style. They concentrate attention upon more formal matters, sentence-structure, paragraphing, 'invention' and the like. But words are the life-blood of speech. To disregard them is to misunderstand the very process of thought-communication. Words are not algebraic symbols, having exact and fixed values. We cannot set up our sentences as the mathematician sets up his equations. The same word does not always bear the same meaning. Every word has had its own organic growth, carries with it a variable set of associations, may appeal to one ear and fall dead upon another. How, then, are we to learn to use words correctly? As one artist learns from another the art of coloring, by observation and imitation. Imitation, of course, in the higher sense, not aping, which results in mere mannerism. More than a century ago LESSING said, with his usual sagacity, that we might imagine a Raphael without hands, but never a Raphael without eyes. What LESSING meant was that the artist's one essential quality is vision. The artist must *see* his object, its form, its color, its relations, and he must also see every line and shade that he is to use in its representation, must see them in his mind before attempting to convey them to the canvas. Is it any different in literary style? Must not the writer see his object in all its details, must he not select from the treasury of speech just the word that will reproduce his mental vision? The worst mistake that he can make is to think that one word will answer as well as another.

2. Here is the explanation of MACAULAY'S failure to achieve mastery in style. He is lacking in artistic vision. And where he is weak, CARLYLE is strong. When PROF. McELROY

speaks, column 58, of MACAULAY'S "power of calling spirits from the vasty deep, his admirable choice of words," he speaks a language which to me at least is unintelligible. If MACAULAY ever called up spirits from the deep, assuredly they were like Glendower's, they refused to come when he did call them. But it is safer, perhaps more charitable, to believe that MACAULAY never tried to call them. Of all prominent English writers he is the least spiritual, the most given to gliding over the surface of life and character. There is not in his writings a single serious and sustained attempt to penetrate into the depth of being or of a being. And his choice of words is not admirable. The utmost that we can say of it is that it is correct within the limits of mediocre conventionalism. The writer who patterns himself after MACAULAY, will never make any serious blunder in diction, on the other hand he will never surprise from nature one of those winged words that flit from soul to soul.

One example will suffice. In reviewing CROKER'S 'BOSWELL,' MACAULAY puts thus aphoristically his estimate of BOSWELL: "He has no second. He has distanced all his competitors so decidedly that it is not worth while to place them. Eclipse is first, and the rest nowhere." This is a phrase which may tickle the popular ear, 'Eclipse first and the rest nowhere,' but will it not grieve the judicious? There are competitions in real life which resemble a horse-race, and MACAULAY knew them thoroughly. But is the writing of biography one of them? Is a biographer a jockey lashing his Pegasus to the plaudits of a frantic throng? If we wish for a true winged word, let us turn to CARLYLE'S judgment upon CROKER'S editorial labors: "tombstone-information." It is a brief phrase, but the coiner of it must have seen into CROKER, must also have seen into the depths of speech.

3. Whether the reader agree or disagree with the above view of style, in either case he will now understand how I came to describe MACAULAY as writing to captivate some imaginary bystander looking over his shoulder. Such a conclusion, isolated from what preceded it, is somewhat startling; but it was preceded by a series of propositions which em-

bodied the *Motive*. Briefly stated, these propositions were:

a. A saying of EMERSON'S, that while there might be many ways of doing a thing ill, there could be only one way of doing it well.

b. A quotation from MATTHEW ARNOLD, explaining the secret of HOMER'S effectiveness, namely, because he always composed with his eye solely upon the object.

c. An application to MACAULAY, stating that he composed, not with his eye on the object but rather with his eye upon the reader. Hence he composed not well in the Emersonian sense, and his choice of words could not be apt, or truly picturesque, in the Homeric sense.

The reader may accept this sequence of thought in whole or in part, or may reject it altogether, as he shall see fit. But in any event he can scarcely reject it on the ground of incoherence.

MACAULAY'S true position in literature is usually misunderstood. He is placed among the great writers; whereas he belongs of right among the orators. His true field was not the printed page but the floor of the House of Commons. Here he was without his match. In that noble arena no Tory gladiator ever made him lower his sword's point for an instant. At a time when parliamentary eloquence was at its height he always carried the House. How could it have been otherwise? He united in himself all the requisites of a successful debater: earnest conviction, immense knowledge, ready wit, and an *instantaneous perception of the weakness of his adversary*. The last gift outweighs, in my judgment, all the others. I have said that in order to write well one must see clearly. In his rightful sphere, debate, MACAULAY did see clearly. He had the special gift of intuition. The promptness with which he detected a sophism and branded it in apt words, the nimbleness with which he met an objection and turned it upon the objector, are to me marvellous. The Tories of those days—there were some great men among them—must have often gnashed their teeth in sheer despair.

But it behooves us to remember that parliamentary oratory is not literature. It is dis-

course *ad hoc*; literature speaks to the endless future. As writer, MACAULAY debates, seeks to capture the reader by a majority vote. His History of England is a long harangue. His essays are short harangues. Everywhere somebody, some cause, is to be attacked or defended. Nowhere is his eye searching below the surface, detecting hidden analogies and discriminating between apparent resemblances. We can generally learn from him how men acted outwardly, how things looked on the surface at a given juncture. But if we ask of him why men acted thus, if we call upon him to lay bare the complex motives, pride, greed, prejudice, ambition, that resulted in an action or a policy, we shall ask in vain. MACAULAY has but the seven primary colors with which to paint character: his palette is without intermediate shades. Vanity is vanity with him, pride is pride, wisdom is wisdom. If this judgment appear too sweeping, I can only ask the reader to test it. MACAULAY has given his opinion upon many literary Englishmen, upon MILTON, BUNYAN, DRYDEN, SWIFT, GOLDSMITH, JOHNSON, BYRON. Selecting these seven as samples of complexity and diversity, I put the question: Into which of the seven has MACAULAY *seen*? MILTON is a learned saint, BUNYAN an inspired tinker, DRYDEN a renegade, SWIFT a ribald, GOLDSMITH a lively, chatty fool, JOHNSON a churl, BYRON a sentimental dandy. Some of us, truly, had been able to find out that much for ourselves. But we wish to know more, we wish to know precisely what it was in each one of the seven that made him great, made him a power. And this MACAULAY is unable to tell us, because he himself has not found it out.

4. Passing from MACAULAY to CARLYLE, let us dwell only upon the more obvious features of contrast. And let us begin with a general admission. It is not at all needful to be a blind follower of the sage of Chelsea. It will lighten our hearts to confess, without urging thereto, that CARLYLE'S views are often wrong, outrageously wrong, and when wrong are usually enforced with a brutality that shocks every fibre of one's conscience. One sample will suffice, his estimate of SCOTT, given in his review of LOCKHART'S 'Life.'

Seldom has literary immorality been more flagitious. We can account for it only as an overflow of personal dislike. CARLYLE is usually taken to be a liberal. At bottom he was only a Scotch Calvinist, the finer part of Calvinism rubbed off and replaced by a thin veneer of German Rationalism. For SCOTT, the genial Jacobite and Royalist, the despiser of 'metaphysical' hair-splitting, CARLYLE had no sympathy, scarcely even understanding.

Yet we can easily afford to be just to CARLYLE. He was often, let us say, color-blind. He often saw his object unconsciously in a wrong light, and this defect of vision was organic and incurable. But when he saw his object aright, no man, Englishman or otherwise, ever described it more clearly, more vividly, with greater spiritual intuition. His failures are not due, like MACAULAY's, to wilfully diverting his gaze from the object to the reader. Hence it is that the most indignant reader of CARLYLE will sympathize with him, even though it be under protest. At his worst he can always teach us, if nothing else, the warning lesson that if the soul's eye be blind then is the whole body full of darkness. Can we learn a like lesson of humility from MACAULAY? We shall rather remember LORD MELBOURNE's despairing ejaculation: "Would to God I could be as sure of anything as TOM MACAULAY is of everything."

On the other hand, when CARLYLE is right, how very right he is, how wholesome, how exhilarating! How each subtle thought finds its organic expression! To illustrate this, and at the same time point the comparison, let me place side by side two extracts from MACAULAY's and CARLYLE's reviews of CROKER's 'BOSWELL.'

a. MACAULAY. "BOSWELL attained it [literary eminence] by reason of his weakness. If he had not been a great fool, he would never have been a great writer . . . Logic, eloquence, wit, taste, all those things which are generally considered as making a book valuable, were utterly wanting to him. He had, indeed, a quick observation and a retentive memory. These qualities, if he had been a man of sense and virtue, would scarcely of themselves have sufficed to make him conspicuous; but because he was a dunce, a

parasite, and a coxcomb, they have made him immortal."

CARLYLE. "Nay, sometimes a strange enough hypothesis has been started of him (BOSWELL); as if it were in virtue even of those same bad qualities that he did his good work; as if it were the very fact of his being among the worst men in this world that had enabled him to write one of the best books therein. Falsely hypothesis, we may venture to say, never rose in human soul. *Bad* is by its nature negative, and can do *nothing*; whatsoever enables us to *do* anything is by its very nature *good*. Alas, that there should be teachers in Israel, or even learners, to whom this world-ancient fact is still problematical, or even deniable. BOSWELL wrote a good book because he had a heart and an eye to discern wisdom, and an utterance to render it forth; because of his free insight, his lively talent,—above all, of his love and childlike open-mindedness. His sneaking sycophancies, his greediness and forwardness, whatever was bestial and earthy in him, are so many blemishes in his book, which still disturb us in its clearness; wholly hindrances, not helps. Towards JOHNSON, however, this feeling was not sycophancy, which is the lowest, but reverence, which is the highest of human feelings. . . . For ourselves, let every one of us cling to this last article of faith and know it as the beginning of all knowledge worth the name: that neither JAMES BOSWELL's good book, nor any other good thing, in any time or in any place, was, is, or can be performed by any man in virtue of his *badness*, but always and solely in spite thereof."

b. MACAULAY. "The characteristic peculiarity of his (JOHNSON's) intellect was the union of great powers with low prejudices. If we judged of him by the best parts of his mind, we should place him almost as high as he was placed by the idolatry of BOSWELL; if by the worst parts of his mind, we should place him even below BOSWELL himself. Where he was not under the influence of some strange scruple or some domineering passion, which prevented him from boldly and fairly investigating a subject, he was a wary and acute reasoner, a little too much inclined to scepticism, and a little too fond of paradox.

No man was less likely to be imposed upon by fallacies in argument or by exaggerated statements of fact. But if, while he was beating down sophisms and exposing false testimony, some childish prejudices, such as would excite laughter in a well-managed nursery, came across him, he was smitten as if by enchantment. His mind dwindled away under the spell from gigantic elevation to dwarfish littleness. Those who had lately been admiring its amplitude and its force were now as much astonished at its strange narrowness and feebleness as the fisherman in the Arabian tale, when he saw the Genie whose stature had overshadowed the whole sea-coast, and whose might seemed equal to a contest with armies, contract himself to the dimensions of his small prison, and lie there the helpless slave of the charm of Solomon."

CARLYLE. "More legibly is this influence of the loving heart to be traced in his (JOHNSON'S) intellectual character. What, indeed, is the beginning of intellect, the first inducement to the exercise thereof, but attraction towards somewhat, *affection* for it? Thus, too, who ever saw, or will see, any true talent, not to speak of genius, the foundation of which is not goodness, love? From JOHNSON'S strength of affection we deduce many of his intellectual peculiarities; especially that threatening array of perversions, known under the name of 'Johnson's Prejudices.' Looking well into the root from which these sprang, we have long ceased to view them with hostility, can pardon and reverently pity them. Consider with what force early-imbibed opinions must have clung to a soul of this affection. Those evil-famed prejudices of his, that Jacobitism, Church-of-Englandism, hatred of the Scotch, belief in witches, and suchlike, what were they but the ordinary beliefs of well-doing, well-meaning, provincial Englishmen in that day? First gathered by his father's hearth; round the kind 'Country-fires' of native Staffordshire; they grew with his growth and strengthened with his strength; they were hallowed by fondest sacred recollections; to part with them was to part with his heart's blood. If the man who has no strength of affection, strength of belief, have

no strength of prejudice, let him thank heaven for it, but to himself take small thanks.

"Melancholy it was, indeed, that the noble JOHNSON could not work himself loose from these adhesions; that he could only purify them, and wear them with some nobleness. Yet let us understand how they grew out from the very centre of his being; nay, moreover, how they came to cohere in him with what formed the business and worth of his life, the sum of his whole spiritual endeavour. For it is on the same ground that he became throughout an edifier and repairer, not, as the others of his make were, a puller-down; that in an age of universal scepticism, England was still to produce its believer. Mark, too, his candor even here; while a DR. ADAMS, with placid surprise, asks: 'Have we not evidence of the soul's immortality?' JOHNSON answers: 'I wish for more.'"

The reader will have no difficulty in reading between the lines. As a sample of the heinousness of MACAULAY'S exaggeration, let the following phrase suffice: "He (BOSWELL) was . . . an unsafe companion who never scrupled to repay the most liberal hospitality by the basest violation of confidence." Aside from the question of fact involved in the assertion, as a mere matter of style one may well ask: If BOSWELL had treacherously stabbed a brother laird in a drunken brawl, or robbed a savings bank, or run off with his neighbor's wife, where would MACAULAY have found words adequate?

5. PROF. MCELROY, column 59, expresses himself thus: "Suppose, for example, that MACAULAY had thought as CARLYLE thought. Would the brilliancy of his style in that case have offended us? Nay, would not his many charms of manner, unimpaired as they would then have been, only have added to his legitimate effect upon us? We were told in the Convention that CARLYLE first wrote as MACAULAY did, but afterwards deliberately changed his style. Was it not because he believed that, by intentionally adopting the peculiarities that characterize his later work, he would the more certainly secure an audience? Surely there was never a more conceited, self-conscious great man than CARLYLE."

a. The supposition involves an impossibility. MACAULAY could never have thought as CARLYLE thought, for the all-sufficient reason that it was not in him to do so.

b. "Brilliancy" of style, the brilliancy which consists in heaping up superlatives, balancing phrases, juggling with the mere *order* of words, is offensive, whether in MACAULAY, or in CARLYLE, or in BURKE, or even in SHAKESPEARE or MILTON. The assertion that CARLYLE'S early style resembled MACAULAY'S in rhetoric is true. Here is the warrant for it:

"SCHILLER seems to have the greater genius; ALFIERI the more commanding character. ALFIERI'S greatness rests on the stern concentration of fiery passion under the dominion of an adamant will . . . SCHILLER'S moral force is commensurate with his intellectual gifts and nothing more. The mind of the one is like the ocean, beautiful in its strength, smiling in the radiance of Summer, and washing luxuriant and romantic shores: that of the other is like some black unfathomable lake placed far amid the melancholy mountains; bleak, solitary, desolate; but girdled with grim, sky-piercing cliffs, overshadowed with storms, and illuminated only by the red glare of the lightning."

This is written with an eye to the reader, and is correspondingly "brilliant." But whoever tries to understand ALFIERI and SCHILLER by such red glare of lightning will get his labor for his pains.

c. There is no warrant for the assumption that CARLYLE "deliberately" changed his style. Style is not a garment to be donned or doffed at will. The change in CARLYLE'S style came gradually and—I suspect—unconsciously. Doubtless it came from a prolonged and searching study of GOETHE, the least rhetorical of writers. Doubtless it was a sense of the utter inadequacy of such SCHILLER-ALFIERI turgidity to render GOETHE'S serene, naïve, Olympian straightforwardness, that gave to CARLYLE'S mind its new direction. It was GOETHE who taught CARLYLE the supreme value of words, the insignificance of phrase-structure. CARLYLE himself says of his later syntax:

"Of his sentences perhaps not more than nine-tenths stand straight on their legs; the

remainder are in quite angular attitudes, buttressed up by props (of parentheses and dashes), and ever with this or the other tag-rag hanging from them; a few even sprawl out helplessly on all sides, quite broken-backed and dismembered."

We are not to apply self-irony and mock self-depreciation too literally. 'In Memoriam' is the most carefully planned and best sustained didactic poem in our language, yet the author condescendingly speaks of it as "little swallow flights of song." All that CARLYLE meant by his caricature of Teufelsdröckh was that the reader should not expect of him stilted rhetoric *à la* Blair.

b. Conceding that CARLYLE is conceited and self-conscious, the sole question that concerns us here is, how far his style may suffer therefrom. Only in so far as prejudice prevented him, as it prevented JOHNSON, from seeing the object aright. Where CARLYLE saw clearly, there he described unerringly, notwithstanding all his self-consciousness. As for his "crudities," his "Babylonian dialect," his "boisterousness and utter want of self-containment," they exist only for the reader who is unfamiliar with the word-wealth of our language. Above all other prose-writers CARLYLE has the infallible artist-touch in his use of words. Coming from him, each noun, adjective, verb is instinct with life. He handles them as a florist handles his flowers, knowingly, caressingly, lovingly. He does not toss them at us, as the baker tosses his rolls over the counter, a roll for a penny. How can one be boisterous and lacking in self-containment, whose every word pulses with its own organic life, grows into its place?

We may reject as many of his opinions as we see fit, may shrug our shoulders at 'Shooting Niagara' and the reviler of poor Cuffee. It is easy work. In no writer perhaps is it easier to separate the wheat from the chaff. But which of us can truthfully assert that he has mastered CARLYLE'S style, that he knows enough of English literature and language to make the attempt? Although some of his best sayings have become almost as threadbare as "To Be or Not To Be," the sympathetic reader can not glance furtively at them without renewing his old sense of humiliation

at his own ignorance. Where did the man get his words, from what slums of trash, what dust-heaps of neglected lore did he evoke such dainty Ariels, such elvish Pucks, such towering invective Lears, serene Prosperos, tenderly-brooding Hermiones? They humble us, as SHAKESPEARE'S masterful touch humbles us. Yet this is the writer whom some would call *Megalosaurian*! Rather let us call ALEXANDER EVERETT a megalosaurian, or even the great MACAULAY, in his triple brass of whiggism, conventionalism, omniscience.

J. M. HART.

University of Cincinnati.

*DANTESCA.—OSSERVAZIONI SU
ALCUNI PASSAGGI DELLA
DIVINA COMMEDIA.*

Prima di cominciare questo articolo devo avvertire il lettore, che non ho potuto consultare i comentatori antichi, neppure tutti gli autori moderni che nelle loro vite di DANTE o nelle loro edizioni o versioni della Divina Commedia potrebbero essersi valuti dell'occasione di parlare dei punti da me trattati. Doveva dunque chiedermi se non sarebbe stato meglio aspettare con questo piccolo saggio, finchè non avessi comparata la letteratura suddetta; ma veduto il monte di scritti danteschi, che si sono accumulati da tutte le parti, par essere cosa impossibile l'accorgersi dell'apparato scientifico completo a qualunque uomo lasciato, come mi trovo io, senza i vantaggi d'una biblioteca pubblica: era piuttosto necessario far scelta fra le ottime, ossia le ultime pubblicazioni, essendo permesso di supporre, che nelle ricerche pubblicate nel *Dante-Jahrbuch* e nelle opere dottissime dei BLANC, WITTE, WEGELE, PHILAETHES, HETTINGER; CARY, CARLYLE, LONGFELLOW, PLUMPTRE possano trovarsi rappresentate e discusse quasi tutte le teorie degli antichi siccome dei contemporanei. Se dunque non trovava in quegli autori nessuna delle osservazioni, che vorrei far io, ci era luogo a credere, che non le trovarono eglino stessi nelle loro fonti, ovvero—che il solo silenzio lor pareva bastante per ribatterle. In ogni caso spero che non si vorranno giudicare inopportune le annotazioni seguenti, sia che io co-

minci qui un filo nuovo, o che riprenda il bandolo perduto dagli autori inglesi.

Caccianli i Ciel per non esser men belli,
Nè lo profondo inferno gli riceve,
Chè alcuna gloria i rei avrebber d'elli.
Inf. III, 40-43.

L'ultimo verso di questo terzetto è stato interpretato in tre o quattro varj modi secondo che ho trovato.

Gli uni, spiegando *alcuna gloria* nel senso negativo, dicono che non furono ammessi nell'inferno gli spiriti neutri, perchè, secondo DANTE, non furono degni neppure di questo luogo, essendo peggiori anche degli stessi rei.

Il Symonds (An introduction to the study of DANTE. London, 1882, p. 144) ha adottato questa interpretazione e sentendo bene l'ingiustizia della sentenza, ne fa rampogna al poeta. Il HETTINGER all' incontro, il quale sembra ammettere questa traduzione anch' egli, si prova di giustificarne l'idea, riferendosi al versetto 15-16 dell'apocalissi III. (HETTINGER, Die göttliche Komödie des DANTE Alighieri nach ihrem wesentlichen Inhalt und Character, p. 147).

Secondo altri, e ne prendo come esempio il LONGFELLOW, gli indifferenti non furono accettati *dai rei*, perchè non erano riconosciuti uguali dai peccatori attivi, quasiccome nella maëstranza dei ladri i birboni inveterati e finiti guardano giù con disprezzo sui giovini novizzi, o mal destri nel loro mestiere. Prende dunque anche il LONGFELLOW *alcuna* come pronome negativo.

Il maggior numero dei comentatori intende *alcuna* nel senso ordinario per *alquanto* e crede, che gli indifferenti non potevano essere incorporati nell' inferno per non dare ai rei nessuna cagione di sentire soddisfazione o gioja maligna, vedendo che per non aver fatto alcun male, i neutri avessero da patire la medesima pena ch' eglino stessi. Tale almeno è l'interpretazione data dal CARY e adottata dall' ultimo traduttore inglese, il PLUMPTRE.

Quanto agli autori tedeschi che ho potuto comparare, mi pare, che capiscano il nostro passaggio nella stessa maniera; ma è vero, che le traduzioni: "weil Sünder stolz auf sie doch blicken könnten," (Philal.) e "dass

nicht mit ihnen die Verdammten prahlen" (STRECKFUSS, GOEBEL, Sechs Vorlesungen über DANTE. Bielefeld, Leipzig, 1882), sono espressioni alquanto vaghe che potrebbero significare anche, che i rei sarebbero contenti non già dalla pena ma della compagnia dei neutri.

Ma qualunque sia il senso voluto, credo che nessuna delle traduzioni citate fin qui corrisponda compiutamente al concetto altissimo che l'ALLIGHIERI aveva della giustizia divina. È ben vero che il poeta, carattere energico e passionato egli stesso, ha versato tutto il suo disprezzo su questi miseri pusillanimità; ma per essere passionato non potrebbe essere ingiusto, nè farebbe commettere atto d'ingiustizia al giudice supremo. Ecco ciò, che bisogna tenere ben distinto! Che l'*accidia* sia falta gravissima dal punto di vista dogmatico, può essere, ma checchè ne dicano il domma o la Chiesa, è sicuro, siccome l'hanno provato il WEGELE, il WITTE, lo SCARTAZZINI ed altri, che DANTE non ha seguito esclusivamente il domma, ma che il suo sistema ha subito anche l'influsso di diversi altri momenti e in specie che dappertutto risulta d'un senso naturale e correttissimo di giustizia umana ossia cristiana.

Il LONGFELLOW crede dovere la sua versione all' espressione: nè lo profondo inferno gli riceve; questo RICEVE pertanto certamente non vuol dire che i rei possano scegliere la loro compagnia e che non vogliano quella dei neutri, ma ci è detto solamente che non gli riceve l'inferno, non lor è aperto, naturalmente per ordine di Dio. Siccome fa spesso nelle sue note eccellenti, il LONGFELLOW cerca illustrare la sua versione, citando passaggi paralleli di altre poesie. Ma questa volta, credo, ha sbagliato. Due dei passaggi citati sono presi da poesie leggiere e frivole, che non possono servire a spiegare il poema dantesco, ed il terzo è il versetto biblico, lo stesso che il HETTINGER ha citato in favore dell' opinione, che abbiamo discussa di sopra. Ed affatto, se fosse permesso di tutto il citare questo versetto, dovrebbe essere inteso come l'ha fatto il HETTINGER, perchè non vi è il Satanasso che giudica, come pel passaggio dantesco l'ha voluto il LONGFELLOW, ma: "ὁ Ἀμὴν, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινός, ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ."—In ogni caso tutti quelli che traducono alcuna per nessuna,

ammettono l'idea stranissima, che gli indifferenti fossero lasciati fuori dell' inferno—per fare piacere ai rei, come se fosse l'intenzione divina l'usar gentilezze ai suoi nemici.

La terza versione colle varietà rappresentate dal PLUMPTRE e dagli autori tedeschi i quali ho citati, è grammaticalmente corretta ed a prima vista non sembra fare torto all' alto senso di giustizia che in tutto il suo poema mostra l'ALLIGHIERI, ma pure fa sottintendere anche essa, che da diritto i neutri dovrebbero essere nell' inferno e che non si trovino là per una causa che non risulta già del loro stato morale proprio, ma d'una considerazione pratica, esterna, voglio dire della necessità di non lasciare ai rei alcuno conforto. In primo luogo, non vediamo in nessun altra parte dell' Inferno, che i rei trovino consolazione nell' idea d'essersi almeno dato buon tempo, commettendo i delitti, che devono pagare nell' inferno. È vero che l'aver dei compagni nella pena lor è un conforto (cf. GIULIANI, Dante-Jahrbuch III, 243), ma è sicuro anche, che per tal ragione, voglio dire per torlo via a loro, questo conforto, non deve mai uno spirito mancare al suo posto. Carlino sarà il vicino del Camicion de' Pazzi, checchè questi ed altri ne sentano. Infine, nessuna ragione può avere alcun effetto sul giudice supremo, che non sia ispirata dalla sola ed unica giustizia. Non sono dunque nell' inferno i neutri, perchè non l'hanno meritato, non sarebbe giusto. Tutte le pene dell' inferno, come si sa, non sono altro, se non la continuazione e conseguenza diretta dello stato mentale dei peccatori innanzi alla morte. Era dunque data in avanzo e fissa pel loro carattere stesso la condizione dei neutri, devono venire esattamente là, dove appartengono, e—l'inferno non sarebbe luogo acconcio a loro. Ecco la ragione, nella costruzione, nel carattere e nello scopo dell' inferno, ragione parallela a quella, perchè non possono entrare nel cielo:

Caccianli i Ciel per non esser men belli, nè lo profondo* inferno li riceve,—perchè il regno dei rei avrebbe subito un cambio in meliorem partem per l'addizione dei neutri. Questi

*Forse è notevole l'add. *profondo*. Pensando qui in specie agli angeli neutri, e solamente in secondo luogo agli spiriti accidiosi, il poeta sembra accennare alla settima bolgia. C. XIV. ss.

spiriti pusillanimi possono ben essere, e certamente sono, sdegnevoli ed odiosi a Dio, eppure hanno una certa gloria, un sembiante di merito. La mancanza di peccato è naturalmente men degna di castigo che un peccato mortale: il niente è come un più relativo in confronto d'un debito immenso. Nell' inferno tutto deve essere terribile, colpito dall' ira eterna di Dio, contrasto perfetto dell' alta beatitudine del Paradiso, e questo carattere orribilmente brutto non deve essere mitigato pell' addizione d'un elemento non meno sdegnevole, come pare a noi, ma meno atroce. Dunque:

Nè lo profondo inferno gli riceve—
Per non esser men orribile.

Amor che a nullo amato amar perdona,
Mi prese del costui piacer si forte
Che, come vedi, ancor non m'abbandono.
Inf. V, 103-105.

Le parole *del costui piacer* si trovano spiegate nel PLUMPTRE come espressione avverbiale, rafforzante in un modo generale la frase principale: *amor mi prese*:

Love, which does none beloved from loving
spare,
Seized me for him with might that such joy
bred,
That, as thou seest, it leaves me not e'en
here.

E similmente le traducono altri; e. g. il Philalethes:—liess mich an ihm so gross Gefallen finden—e il traduttore greco, Dante-Jahrbuch I, 388:

Ὁ ἔρως δέ, ὃς οὐποτε ἐρῶντας ἀπαλλαττει
Τοσοῦτον πόθον μοι αὐτοῦ ἐνέπνευσε συν-
χρόνως.

Un'altra versione tutta differente, si legge nel CARY e, come seconda scelta in Nota, nel CARLYLE:—caught me *with pleasing him*.

Mi pare sicuro, che col CARY ed altri, dobbiamo riguardare *del costui piacer* come genetivo oggettivo dipendente da *amor*, appunto come nel terzetto precedente *della bella persona*:

Amor, che al cor gentil ratto s'apprende,
Prese costui della bella persona—

Dice dunque la Francesea: io fui presa d'amore verso—il costui piacer, e viene poi da chiedere: che cosa vuol dire *il costui piacer*? Secondo la versione *with pleasing him*, *costui* sarebbe il dativo dipendente da *piacer*, e ci sarebbe da sottintendere il pronome *mio* (piacer). Questa interpretazione non credo che sia giusta. Non parlando già della difficoltà grammaticale, che sola mi par renderla molto dubbiosa, il pensiero riescerebbe alquanto sgraziato: *amor mi prese del mio piacere a lui*.

Costui deve essere il genetivo possessivo, e *piacer* potrebbe stare per *piacenza*, carattere (o apparenza) piacevole, grazioso (cf. Par. XX, 144), corrispondente quasi al *della bella persona* (v. 101) anche nel senso.

E poichè *piacevole*, *grazioso*, *amabile* sono mezzi termini, significanti indistintamente una persona simpatica, o che meriti simpatia, o che la mostri ella stessa, avremo solamente a prendere *piacenza* nell' ultimo senso per ritrovarvi inchiusa l'idea, che mette la frase principale in connessione logica colla frase relativa.

Ma può essere anche che *piacere* abbia questo senso attivo* senz' altro, significando semplicemente simpatia, affezione, amore: io fui presa d'amore verso la sua affezione: il suo amore; mi ferzò a riamarlo; perchè amor a nullo amato amar perdona.

È vero che nel terzetto precedente non si trova lo stesso sviluppo logico, o almeno non si trova indicato nella stessa maniera, ma sarebbe andar troppo lontano, sicuramente, il valersi di questo motivo per combattere la nostra versione.

Il LONGFELLOW, come la nota aggiunta da lui al verso che stiamo considerando, sembra aver con un giusto senso poetico, indovinato nel nostro passaggio quasi la stessa idea, che ne abbiamo cavata per mezzo della grammatica; ma sbagliandosi nel punto grammaticale, l'illustre traduttore americano non ha voluto seguire la sua ispirazione nel testo, ma ha tradotto:

Love—Seized me with pleasure of this man.

In ogni caso il PLUMPTRE avrebbe fatto meglio citando, se non voleva adottarle, la

*Cf. *parere* con il *parere*, io sono di *parere*.

spiegazione del CARY e la nota del LONGFELLOW.

Queste parole da lor ci fur porte, [Inf. V, 108], e la teoria del FEIST.

In GROEBER'S Zs. f. r. Ph. XI, 131-133, A. FEIST ha proposto una teoria interamente nuova intorno al passaggio Inf. V, 88-107. Secondo il suo concetto le parole, che fin allora tutto il mondo aveva creduto che fossero parlate da Francesca sola, dovrebbero dividersi in cinque parti: la prima, 88-96, e l'ultima, 106-107, sarebbero pronunciate dai due amanti insieme; la seconda, 97-99, e la quarta, 103-105, da Francesca sola; e la parte del mezzo, la terza, da Paolo.

Si vede, che la congettura è delle più importanti, cambiando interamente tutto il carattere del passaggio ed attribuendo quasi a ciascheduna frase un senso tutt'altro che non le fosse dato innanzi. È vero anche che alcuni momenti, benissimo esposti dal Feist, parlano fortemente in favore della sua idea, eppure non posso ancora appigliarmi perché ci si oppongono altri momenti non meno gravi, ai quali il FEIST non ha fatto attenzione nel suo trattato.

Cominciando la sua dimostrazione col verso: *Queste parole da lor ci fur porte*, dice che *da lor* indichi chiaramente, che ambe e due gli spiriti devono aver parlato. Questo non mi par essere assolutamente necessario. In primo luogo arriva spesso ed è tutto naturale, che avendo inteso un uomo parlare come rappresentante d'un gruppo, diciamo dopo: *dicevano* invece di *diceva*. Si spiegano i due amanti inseparabili pella bocca di Francesca, come dell'altra parte DANTE solo gli ha chiamati, a lui solo s'è indirizzata la risposta, eppure alla fine troviamo: *ci fur porte*. Le due espressioni *da lor* e *ci* sono assolutamente parallele, non significando altro se non: del loro posto—al nostro, di là—ci.

Inoltre *porgere*, benchè talvolta equivalga a *parlare*, non è pure precisamente lo stesso, ma significa *offrire*, *dare* (la risposta); e forse, che nel *porte* si possa vedere il participio di *porgere* e nell'istesso tempo quello di *portare*. *Porto* per portato: portare sarebbe come desto: destare, privo: privare, etc.

Sarebbe allora il senso: queste parole ci fur offerte, date a risposta, da loro (per la bocca di Francesca), ovvero ci furono tramesse (pell'aere) dal loro posto, e non è dunque assolutamente necessaria la nuova interpretazione, come l'ha creduto il suo autore. Vediamo adesso, se è probabile.

Quanto al carattere generale del passaggio, che il FEIST pensa essere più bello secondo la sua accezione, si può essere di opinione differente, ed io, per uno, preferisco la semplicità del vecchio senso allo stile—non dirò già lirico o drammatico—ma declamatorio ed artificioso della nuova versione. Ma di ciò non dirò nulla, perchè *de rebus aestheticis* come *de gustibus*, non disputandum.

Ci sono pertanto altre obiezioni più particolari da fare:

Il parlare insieme dei due spiriti non mi pare dantesco, chè non si trova in nessuna parte un passaggio parallelo; e poi, i primi terzetti, in especie, non essendo altro se non una semplice introduzione, non sono punto addattati ad essere pronunciati dai due insieme. Pare cosa stranissima, davvero, l'immaginarsi recitate dai due amanti, queste parole quiete e quasi prosaiche.

Della difficoltà grammaticale, che offre il tradurre *costui* per *questo* (cuore) non bisogna parlare qui, perchè il FEIST l'ha mentovata egli stesso. Ma mentre vuole, che la *donna* non dovrebbe chiamare *bella persona* il suo corpo, che *pur non ha più*, il FEIST non esita a fare dire all'uomo

Amor, che al *cor gentil* ratto s'apprende
Prese *costui* (v. d. il *mio*, secondo il FEIST).

Senza gusto, quando le pronuncia Paolo, queste parole all'incontro sono bellissime nella bocca della donna che cerca spiegare con esse e giustificare la passione del suo amante.

Il verso *e il modo ancor m'offende* è estremamente insignificante nel senso che gli dà il FEIST, ed il *che mi fu tolta* non sarebbe possibile del tutto, se *persona* sta per *donna*, perchè affatto non sono separati gli amanti. Il loro amore è più forte che l'inferno stesso e non è la perdita dell'amore, che lamentano, ma la loro eterna dannazione.

Avrei altre obiezioni a fare, ma credo che

basterà ciò che ho detto e forse sono già stato troppo lungo.

Tocchiamo solamente in passando un'altra questione indipendente dalla teoria del FEIST, benchè si trovi mentovata nel suo trattato.

Al doloroso passo. Inf. V, 114.

Quel giorno più non vi leggemmo avanti.

Inf. V, 138.

Il FEIST ed altri dicono, che in questi versi si tratti della morte; ma i versi:—

A che e come concedette amore

Che conoscesti i dubbiosi desiri, 119, 120,

e forse

Che ricordarsi del tempo felice, 121,

siccome

—la prima radice

Del nostro amor—, 124, 125,

indicano che il doloroso passo, etc., non sia la morte ma il primo peccato degli amanti.

Finalmente devo dar conto al lettore che mi ha seguito fin qui, perchè, essendo Tedesco io stesso, e vivendo nel "paese la, dove il *yes* suona," abbia osato scrivere il mio articolo in Italiano. L'ho fatto, perchè la lingua italiana è la sola, che debbano capire tutti quelli che al nostro poeta s'interessano: da questi spero che ho riuscito a farmi comprendere, e per altri nè per altra ragione non ho scritto.

GUSTAF KARSTEN.

Indiana University.

THE PERSONAL PRONOUN IN THE OLD DANISH 'TOBIAE COMEDIE.'

The text of the 'Tobiae Comedie' upon which the present paper is based, was edited by S. BIRKET SMITH of Copenhagen, and published in 1887 by the University-Jubilee Danish Union. The editor informs us in the introduction that the original of the play is contained in MS. No. 794, folio, in the Royal Library at Copenhagen. Our comedy is the second of the collection.

"The whole linguistic and dramatic form of the piece," says the editor, "makes it certain

that it cannot be older than the end of the 16th century, and, on the other hand, it was certainly written some time before the 5th of May, 1607, the date of the production of 'De Mundo et Paupere,' contained in the same collection." For convenience' sake, we may fix its date at about 1700. Concerning the name of its author we have no positive information, but from two references in the text the editor infers that it was written in VIBORG.

The language is very rich in grammatical forms, though we already perceive the confusion of the dative and the accusative. In respect to its syntax, we notice many resemblances to Middle English, and, in fact, we might call the Danish of this time the Middle Danish period. The majority of the changes made in the language since that time are orthographic, by which the varying forms have become merged into one invariable form and the spelling has been normalized.

The forms selected for comment in this paper are the personal pronouns, which may be first given in the following tabular order:

Sg. N. ieg [9.10].	du [4.10], [6.1] as vocat.
G. —	—
D. mig [38, 22], migh [46.11].	dig [47.11].
A. mig [47.4].	dig [46.12].
Pl. N. wi [6.3], vi [50, 18] vj [72.10].	i [6.15], y [45.20].
G. —	eders [17.9], ethers [19.4].
D. oss [5.6].	eder [72.21], ether [17.1].
A. oss [55.8].	eder [30.1], ether [17.12].
Sg. N. hand [6.14].	hun [8.1].
G. hans [7.15].	hendis [14.8].
D. ham [7.19], hannem [12.7].	hende [23.15].
A. ham [7.19], hanom [87.11].	—
A. ham [8.4], hannem [22.10].	hende [11.19], hender [8.2].

NOTE 1. In the nom., dat. and acc. of the 1st person, the original final *k* (O. N. *ek* and O. Norw. *mik*) has already changed to *g*. For the change of the voiceless explosives (*k*, *t*) after a vowel to the spirants (*g* and *ð*), see Noreen's *Altisländische Gram.*, p. 73. The same process may be noticed in the *dat.* and *acc.* of the 2d person.

NOTE 2. The *v* of the 1st person plural was sounded like English *w*; the interchange of *i* and *j* is, of course, merely graphic, as is also that of *i* and *y*, in the 2d person plur.

NOTE 3. In the gen., dat. and acc. plur. of the 2d person we find *d*, in place of the

Ur nordisch *ð*; that is, the voiced interdental spirant < voiced dental explosive. In O. N. we find this same change, but only after a long syllable ending in *l, n, b, ð, lg, ng, or, m*, or (after 1300) after a short syllable ending in *l* or *n*. In each of the three cases occurring in our text the preceding syllable ends in a vowel. In pronunciation, however, the *d* between vowels in modern Danish retains its original sound as voiced interdental spirant.

NOTE 4. The gen. sing. and plur. of the 1st and the gen. sing. of the 2d person do not occur in the text; and the dual is wholly lacking, as we should naturally expect at so late a period in the language.

NOTE 5. As in O. N., the neuter and the plural of the 3d person are borrowed from the demonstrative.

NOTE 6. The dat. and the acc. have everywhere completely merged, the only instances in which a difference exists between them being the *migh*, the *hanom*, and the *hender*, which are evidently quite accidental.

NOTE 7. The almost total absence of assimilation in the O. Danish pronominal declension also deserves notice. We have *hand*, *hendis*, *hende*, corresponding to O. N. *hann*, *hennar*, *henne*; though here again we find a difference between the Danish of 1700 and that of the present day. We have, however, *hannem*, *hanom*, corresponding to O. N. *hønom*, and *hånum*.

NOTE 8. The forms *migh*, *hender* and *hanom* occur only once each; all the other forms occur with greater or less frequency through the play.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

Columbia College.

**DIE ROMANHAFTERICHTUNG DER
ALEXIUSLEGENDE**
*in altfranzösischen und mittelhochdeutschen
Gedichten. I.*

In seinen Briefen aus der Schweiz erzählt GÖTTE, welch' tiefen Eindruck auf ihn die Erzählung einer Legende machte, welche ihm eine Bäuerin des Rhonethals, als er nach einer seiner Fusswanderungen durch das Gebirge in ihrem Hause gastete, in schlichten,

aber rührenden Worten vortrug. Diese Erzählung betraf eine Legende, die dereinst im Mittelalter eine ungeheure Verbreitung gefunden und sowohl im französischen als im deutschen, im englischen als im italienischen, im spanischen als im russischen zahlreiche Bearbeitung erfahren hatte, die Legende des h. ALEXIUS.

Das einzige Historische in der Geschichte dieses Mannes—selbst der Name ALEXIUS ist erfunden—erfahren wir aus einer syrischen Legende, die nach Augenzeugen das Leben eines Mannes erzählt, welcher, obgleich reicher und vornehmer Herkunft, seine Familie in Constantinopel verliess, um sich zu den Armen Edessas zu gesellen und ein ascetisches Bettlerleben zu führen.* Wunderbares war also ursprünglich nichts vorhanden in dieser Erzählung, denn solche Beispiele von Entsagung waren im Mittelalter an der Tagesordnung. Aber im Laufe der Zeit wurde aus der einfachen Biographie ein wahrer Roman. Ein Grieche aus Constantinopel war es der die Heirath des ALEXIUS erfand, der ihn seine Frau gleich in der Hochzeitnacht verlassen liess, der seine Rückkehr nach Constantinopel und Aufnahme im Elternhause, wo er lange Zeit unkenntlich und unbekannt von Almosen lebte, hinzudichtete, und schliesslich das Wunder hinzufügte, das ihn nach seinem Tode den Eltern als Heiligen offenbarte. Dieser Roman hatte im Orient riesigen Erfolg. Dem Occident blieb er aber unbekannt, bis Ende des 10ten Jahrhunderts ein aus Damaskus vertriebener Erzbischof SERGIUS ihn nach Rom brachte, wo der Heilige bald so heimisch wurde, dass statt Constantinopel, Rom zur Stätte seiner Leiden gemacht, der Patriarch des griechischen Textes durch den Papst INNOCENS zur Zeit des HONORIUS und ARCADIUS ersetzt, und nach kurzer Zeit sogar das Haus der Eltern des ALEXIUS in Rom gezeigt wurde. Von Rom verbreitete sich dann die Legende nach allen Ländern des Westens und Nordens.

Es kann nicht in unserer Absicht liegen die Entwicklung der Legende durch alle diese Länder zu verfolgen; wir werden uns im folgenden auf Frankreich und Deutschland

**Cl. Romania VIII (1879), p. 163 ff., G. PARIS: "La vie de St. ALEXI en vers octosyllabiques."*

beschränken, und dies aus besonderem Grunde. Im Mittelalter hat, wie bekannt, in litterarischer Beziehung, Frankreich auf Deutschland einen ungeheuren Einfluss ausgeübt. Wie viele bedeutende deutsche Dichtungen gehen doch auf französische Quellen zurück! Man denke nur an das 'Ruolantesliet' des PFAFFEN CONRAD, das aus der Venez. Hs. der 'Chanson de Roland' fusst, an das 'Alexanderlied' des PFAFFEN LAMPRECHT, das auf ALBERICH DE BESANÇON'S Alexanderdichtung beruht! Und haben nicht selbst grössere Dichter wie HEINRICH VON VELDEKE seine 'Eneit' von BENOÎT DE STE. MAURE, HARTMANN VON AUE seinen 'Erec' und 'Iwein' aus CHRESTIEN DE TROYES entnommen! Warum wäre dies nicht auch der Fall für die uns vorliegenden Legenden? Lasst uns darauf hin die französischen und deutschen Gedichte mit einander vergleichen.

Die *französischen* sind: 1. Der von GASTON PARIS in seiner 'Vie de St. Alexis' kritisch hergestellte Text des ST. ALEXIS nach den Hd. von Lamspringen,* von Ashburnham Place und von Paris, aus dem 11ten Jahrhundert. Wir bezeichnen das Gedicht mit P (G. PARIS).

2. Eine stark interpolirte und beinahe um das Doppelte vermehrte Bearbeitung des Gedichtes P, in Assonanzen, von G. PARIS mit durch Cursivschrift hervorgehobenen interpolirten Stellen ed.; aus dem 12ten Jhd. Wir nennen das Gedicht S (ancien Supplément, 623).

3. Eine von S abhängige Bearbeitung desselben Gedichtes in Reimen, von MARI-CHAL ed., M in 1279 v.

4. Eine in 196 vierzeiligen Strophen mit cinem Reime (quatrains monorimes von M abhängige Bearbeitung, von PANNIER ed. Q (Quatrains). Alle diese vier Texte sind abgedruckt in G. PARIS: 'La vie de ST. ALEXIS' P: p. 139-170; S: p. 222-260; M: p. 279-317; A: p. 346-388.

*Wegen dieser in einem deutschen Kloster—Lamspringen liegt bei Hildesheim—aufbewahrten Hs. scheint die Annahme einer Beeinflussung der deutschen Gedichte durch die französischen um so näher zu liegen. Dagegen spricht aber die Bemerkung von G. PARIS p. 2: "Cette abbaye, de l'ordre de St. BENOÎT, était peuplée par des religieux anglais, venus là à ce que nous apprend Mr. HOFFMAN, après 1643, et qui suivant toute apparence apportent avec eux le manuscrit en question."

5. Ein von G. PARIS in der *Romania* VIII (1879), p. 169-180 herausgegebenes Gedicht in 964 achtsilbigen paarweisegereimten Versen, die Hs. aus dem 13ten Jhd., das Gedicht selbst noch vom 12ten Jhd. Wir nennen es R (*Romania*).

6. Ein von JOSEPH HERZ in dem 'Programm der Real- und Volksschule der israelitischen Gemeinde zu Frankfurt am Main 1879' herausgegebenes Gedicht in 60 Laissen, von verschiedener Länge, im Ganzen 1254 Zwölfsilbbern, aus dem 13ten Jhd. Wir nennen es Hz. (HERZ).

Die uns überlieferten deutschen Gedichte sind alle von MASSMANN herausgegeben worden in seinem 'Sanct Alexius Leben in acht gereimten mittelhochdeutschen Behandlung-en.' Sie sind:

A aus einer Grätzer und Prager Hs. mit 1155 v.; B aus Cod. Vindabon. mit 522 v.; C (Münchener, Neuburger und Heidelberger Hs.) mit 454 v.; D von KONRAD VON WÜRZBURG, in einer Strassburger und Innsbrucker Hs. mit 1385 v., auch von HAUPT mit Verbesserungen Zs. III. ed.; E (Hamburger Hs.) mit 1046 v.; F (Hs. der Herren MEYER und MOOYER) mit 1526 v.; G vom Schweizer JÖRG ZOBEL (aus St. Gallen); H vom Augsburger JÖRG BREYNING, aus 1488, in des regenbogen langen dōn in 19 Strophen von je 23 versen.

Diese vierzehn Gedichte lassen sich schon nach oberflächlicher Lectüre in zwei Classen theilen. Die einen erzählen die Legende schlicht und einfach, oft etwas trocken und dürr, meist nach dem Beispiele der lateinischen Prosabehandlung der Bollandisten, welche MASSMANN in seinem Buche ebenfalls abgedruckt hat. Nach ihnen lautet die Legende ungefähr folgendermassen: EUPHEMIAN und AGLAES, die Eltern des Heiligen, führen einen glänzenden Hofstaat, aber zugleich ein recht frommes Leben. Ihr Glück ist nur dadurch getrübt, dass ihre Ehe unfruchtbar bleibt. Erst nach langem Beten und vielen frommen Werken, erhalten sie einen Sohn, ALEXIUS, für dessen Geburt sie Gott geloben von nun an ihr ganzes Leben keusch bleiben zu wollen. Der Sohn wird in der Schule fromm erzogen, er lernt, dass nur durch Keuschheit das ewige Leben erlangt werden kann, und im Stillen seines Herzens gelobt er

sich, ewig keusch zu bleiben. Aber sein Vater, der seinem einzigen Sohne sein bedeutendes Erbe sichern will, beschliesst ihn zu verheirathen, sucht ihm ein Mädchen aus kaiserlichem Geschlechte aus, und obgleich ALEXIUS seine Grundsätze zu heirathen verbieten, thut er es doch, um eine andere Sünde, den Ungehorsam gegen die Eltern, zu vermeiden. Sobald er aber Abends mit seiner Frau allein ist, theilt er ihr seinen Entschluss mit, ewig keusch zu bleiben, ermahnt sie dasselbe zu thun und nachdem er ihr seinen Ring zum Andenken gegeben, verlässt er sie, um im Morgenlande ein ascetischer Leben zu führen. Er gelangt zuerst nach Laodicea, dann nach Edessa, wo er seinen Wohnsitz auf den Stufen einer Kirche aufschlägt, in der ein berühmtes Christusbild verehrt wird. Dort lebt er 17 Jahre lang in Armut unter den Bettlern und gibt sich sogar den Boten seines Vaters nicht zu erkennen, die ihn dort suchen. In Rom herrscht grosse Trauer. Seine Mutter beklagt ihn in Sack und Asche, und seine Braut gelobt sich ihm ewig treu zu bleiben, wie die Turteltaube, die ihren Genossen verliert. So verstreichen siebzehn Jahre. Da will Gott dem Volke von Edessa die Heiligkeit des Bettlers verkünden. Ein Marienbild lässt ihn durch den Messner in die Kirche hereinrufen, und seine Heiligkeit wird bekannt. Aber ALEXIUS, der sich vor menschlichem Ruhme fürchtet, flieht aus Edessa, besteigt ein Schiff, um sich nach Tarsus zu begeben, doch da verschlägt ihn ein Sturm in seine Heimat nach Rom. Da wendet er sich an seinen Vater, den er auf der Strasse antrifft und bittet ihn, um des Sohnes willen, den er verloren, um Aufnahme in seinem Hause. Ein Strohlager wird ihm unter der Treppe bereitet, und obgleich er nur ein Wort zu sagen hätte, um zum gefeierten Herren des Hauses zu werden, indem er von den Dienern verhöhnt und misshandelt wird, bleibt er an seinem Entschluss fest und lebt in frommer Entsagung abermals sechzehn Jahre. Wie er fühlt, dass der Tod ihm naht, schreibt er sein Leben auf, und den Brief in der Hand haltend verscheidet er kurz darauf. Zugleich erhebt sich eine Stimme in der Kirche, wo das Volk versammelt ist, und zu drei verschiedenen Malen ermahnt sie die Römer den Heiligen zu su-

chen, der im Hause des EUPHEMIAN liege. Der Papst und die beiden Kaiser HONORIUS und ARCADIUS, von EUPHEMIAN geführt, der selber nicht weiss, wer der angekündigte Heilige sein könnte, eilen in sein Haus, und von einem Diener auf den eben verstorbenen Pilger aufmerksam gemacht, der stets ein so frommes Leben geführt habe, dass er wohl der gesuchte Heilige sein könnte, finden sie denselben todt unter der Treppe liegend. Und in der That sein Antlitz glänzt wie das eines Engels, und ein süsser Duft geht aus der Leiche hervor. Als EUPHEMIAN und nachher die beiden Kaiser ihm den Brief entnehmen wollen, den er in der Hand hält, weigert sich der Todte ihn herzugeben; nur dem Papste, dem Stellvertreter Gottes, gibt er ihn. Ein Priester liest den Brief, und nun erfahren Eltern und Braut das Unglück, das sich in ihrem Hause ereignet hat. Ihr Jammer ist unbeschreiblich, und macht sich in furchtbaren Klagereden Luft. Endlich lässt der Papst die Leiche wegtragen. Alle Kranken, die den heiligen Leib berühren, werden wieder gesund, und um selbst geheiligt zu werden, tragen der Papst und die Kaiser selbst die Bahre. Aber das Gedränge des Volkes ist so gross, dass um Raum zu schaffen, die Herrscher Gold austreuen lassen, damit das Volk es auflese, und dadurch dem Leichenzuge Platz mache. Doch die Menge zieht es vor dem Heiligen nachzulaufen. So gelangt man erst unter grosser Mühe zur Kirche des h. Bonifacius, wo der Heilige mit grossem Pomp beigesetzt wird.

Wesentlich in dieser Fassung erzählt die eine Gruppe der Bearbeitungen unsere Legende. Unter den deutschen sind es C, D, E, G; unter den französischen, R und Hz. Natürlich herrschen unter diesen Gedichten selbst gewisse Abweichungen. Während C und G recht dürftig, an einigen Stellen ungeniessbar trocken erzählen, ergehen sich D und E in weitschweifige Schilderungen und Moralreflexionen. Doch haben alle diese deutschen Bearbeitungen das Gemeinsame, dass sie kein poetisches Talent zeigen, und ohne sie zu beleben, oft sogar indem sie sie durch unverständiges Kürzen oder geschmackloses Erweitern einstellen, ihre Vorlage wiedergeben. Die französischen dagegen, R und Hz., zeigen,

was ein begabter Dichter auch aus diesem einfachen Stoffe machen konnte, wenn er ihn nur anziehend erzählte. Hier werden die Scenen malerisch geschildert, die Handlungen motivirt, die Gefühle nüancirt. Aus der todtten Legende wird eine lebhaft und rührende Erzählung. Es würde uns zu weit führen an dieser Stelle den Vergleich der einzelnen Gedichte untereinander und die Untersuchung ihrer Quellen zu unternehmen. Es ist dies eine langwierige und spitzfindige Arbeit, die wir an anderer Stelle unternommen haben, und welche uns das Resultat ergab, dass wohl alle diese Gedichte in letzter Instanz auf dieselbe Quelle zurückgehen, aber doch nur durch verschiedene intermediäre Bearbeitungen. Jedenfalls sind wir aber bei dieser Untersuchung zur Überzeugung gekommen, dass die Gedichte der Franzosen und der Deutschen von einander völlig unabhängig sind.

Lohnender und litterarisch weit interessanter ist die kritische Untersuchung und Vergleichung der andern Gruppe der Legenden, welche die Erzählung poetischer entwickelt haben, als die eben besprochene. In dieser Gruppe gehören unter den französischen Gedichten, S, M, Q; unter den deutschen A, F, H. Ueber P werden wir uns näher unten zu erklären haben; über B cfr. R, die Anmerkung.* Das Merkmal, welches uns dazu führt alle diese Gedichte unter einer Gruppe zusammenzufassen, ist dasjenige der Hervorhebung der Braut in denselben. Während in den vorher besprochenen Gedichten die Braut nur eine ganz passive und wesentlich untergeordnete Rolle spielte, haben die Dichter dieser Gruppe

*Es scheint als ob dieses Gedicht B, welches sonst zu den Gedichten der andern Richtung gehört, den einen Zug, die Übergabe des Briefes an die Braut, wie von Hörensagen in seine Bearbeitung aufgenommen habe. Dies ist um so eher anzunehmen, 1. Weil der Zug vereinzelt ist ohne die ihn vorbereitenden sonstigen bräutlichen Züge. 2. Weil die Bearbeitung B überhaupt auf mündliche Quellen zurückzugehen scheint; wegen einiger ganz speciellen Züge—ich kann hier auf Näheres nicht eingehen,—wegen mehrerer Missverständnisse (7 Jahre statt 17 Jahre, *der* Kaiser statt *die* Kaiser) die leicht aus Verhören entstanden sein können, wegen der Kürze der Bearbeitung, und des fast glänzlichen Fehlens von Namen, endlich wegen des ersten Verses des Gedichtes "in einem buoche man uns las," wäre es möglich, dass das Gedicht überhaupt, nach mündlichem Vortrag, den der Dichter gehört und nicht selbst gelesen, nachträglich aufgeschrieben worden sei.

viele Momente erfunden, wo sie in die Handlung eingreift:

1. Die Brautnacht wird ausführlich erzählt und je nach den Bearbeitungen geschildert oder dramatisch belebt.

2. Als ALEXIUS in das Haus seiner Eltern als Bettler zurückkommt tritt seine Braut in nähere Beziehung zu ihm.

3. Als ALEXIUS stirbt gibt er nicht dem Papste, sondern seiner Braut den Brief, in welchem er sein Leben erzählt.

4. Als die Braut des ALEXIUS stirbt, wird sie mit ihm begraben, und der Todte rückt zurecht, um seiner Braut neben sich Platz zu machen.

Nicht alle Gedichte dieser Gruppe, die wir nach MASSMANN'S Vorgänge die bräutliche nennen wollen, haben alle diese Züge gemeinsam. Einige haben nur einen Theil derselben aufzuweisen. Wie ist dies zu erklären? Hat sich etwa die Ummodelung der Legende erst allmählig vollzogen, und auf welche Weise? Haben die einzelnen Gedichte der Gruppe auf einander geübt, haben hauptsächlich die französischen mit den deutschen nähere Beziehungen, welche wechselseitige Benutzung annehmen liessen? Diese Fragen zu lösen, soll unsere Aufgabe auf den folgenden Seiten bilden.

Vorausschicken müssen wir, dass uns eine lateinische Prosabearbeitung vorliegt, welche MASSMANN p. 157-166 abgedruckt hat—wir nennen sie im Folgenden, L—die gerade diese Momente der bräutlichen Legende enthält. Auf den ersten Blick scheint die Annahme einer Abhängigkeit der deutschen oder französischen Gedichte von L sehr wahrscheinlich. Und in der That ist, nach den Untersuchungen von MASSMANN, L die hauptsächlichste Quelle von A. Gerade die bräutlichen Züge hat A aus L entnommen. Die Brautnacht ist in beiden Bearbeitungen ebenso geschildert. An das brennende Licht anknüpfend, das zwischen den Brautleuten steht, erklärt ALEXIUS seiner Braut, dass es um die Welt wie um das Licht bestellt sei. Sie sei dem Verfall anheimgegeben, von Flammen der Begierde umgeben sterbe sie dahin, und bringe uns in ewige Verdammnis. Unsere Seelen müssten wir von den Flammen der Verderbnis befreien und keusch bleiben.

Auch der zweite bräutliche Zug, der Besuch der Eltern und der Braut, als ALEXIUS unter der Treppe liegt, ist in L und A gleich geschildert. Die Braut erkundigt sich eingehend nach ihrem Bräutigam. Der Pilger antwortet, er hätte den ALEXIUS wohl gesehen; er beschrebt ihn und erzählt, was ihm ALEXIUS über seine Flucht aus Rom und die Gründe, die ihn dazu getrieben, gesagt hätte. Sich selber gibt er den Namen "got ergeben," eine wörtliche Uebersetzung des lateinischen "Deo datus."

Auch die zwei übrigen bräutlichen Züge sind ebendieselben in A als in L. Aber nicht bloss auf die Gleichheit dieser Züge sondern auch auf diejenige anderer beruht die Übereinstimmung beider Bearbeitungen:

1. Die Familienverhältnisse des EUPHEMIAN werden möglichst genau angegeben. Er stammt aus dem Geschlechte der Scipionen; der damalige römische Kaiser THEODOSIUS hat ihn so lieb, dass er ihn und seinen Bruder ARSENIUS bei seinem Sohn HONORIUS zum Gött und Gevatter nahm. Seine Frau AGLAE ist die Tochter eines römischen Satrapen JOHANNES.

2. Der Papst SIRICIUS tauft ALEXIUS.

3. Wie ALEXIUS von der Schule abgeht, nimmt er beim Kaiser ritterliche Dienste an.

4. Die Frau, die für ALEXIUS ausgesucht wird, heisst ADRIATICA und ist die Tochter des GREGORIUS, welcher aus dem Geschlechte der Fabricii stammt, die gegen Pyrrhus gekämpft haben.

5. Die Bearbeitung sagt ausdrücklich, dass ein bestimmter Tag zur Hochzeit ausgesucht wird.

6. Von L hat A auch die Pilgerfahrt des ALEXIUS nach Pisa, Lucca und Jerusalem entnommen.

7. Bemerkenswerth ist, dass in A ebenso wie in L, als ALEXIUS' Heiligkeit geoffenbart werden soll, die Glocken läuten, ein Zug, der sich in der andern Legendengruppe nicht findet.

Aber wie eng A auch mit L zusammenhängt, so hat MASSMANN doch herausgefunden, dass A neben L noch die Bollandistenbearbeitung als Quelle benutzt hat. Dies erhellt daraus, dass A noch manche jener Legende eigenenthümliche Züge entnommen hat. So z. B.

den Zug, dass 3000 in Seide gekleidete Diener an EUPHEMIANS Hofe aufwarten, dass täglich drei Tische für Wittwen, Waisen und Pilger gedeckt werden, dass die Mutter, als ihr Sohn verloren gegangen, an ihrem Estrich auf einen Sack sich setzt, von dem sie nicht wieder aufstehen will, bis sie etwas von ihrem Sohne wisse. Ebenso den Vergleich der Braut mit der Turteltaube, die ewig trauert, wenn sie einmal ihren Genossen verloren hat. MASSMANN hat p. 31 eine Vergleichungstabelle der einzelnen übereinstimmenden Momente aufgestellt, aus der zweifellos hervorgeht, dass A beide Quellen benutzte. Ein Umstand zeigt es ganz besonders klar und deutlich. Wenn, wie oben schon gesagt, L den ALEXIUS nach Pisa, Jerusalem und Lucca wandern lässt, die Bollandistenlegende dagegen nach Laodicea und Edessa, so verbindet A Beides und sagt, dass ALEXIUS zuerst nach Pisa, dann nach Laodicea und Edessa, endlich Jerusalem und Lucca zog. Der Verfasser von A hat mit wahrhaft dichterischem Takt aus beiden Quellen die hübschen Züge entnommen, dafür aber die Überbietungen und religiösen Betrachtungen von L fallen lassen. Für das Nähere verweise ich auf MASSMANN, p. 29-31.

Von diesem so glücklich behandelten Gedichte ist ein anderes deutsches abhängig, nämlich das Gedicht von JÖRG BREYNING, aus dem Jahre 1488, H, aber, wie MASSMANN nachweist, erst durch die Vermittelung einer deutschen Prosalegende e—MASSMANN druckt sie p. 180 ff. ab—die sich, von geringen Abweichungen abgesehen, fast überwörtlich an A anschliesst. Cf. MASSMANN, der auch hier wieder eine Tabelle gibt.

HEINRICH SCHNEEGANS.

Genoa, Italy.

STRONG VERBS IN AELFRIC'S SAINTS.—II.

CLASS 4.

*Beran a-, for-, forð-, ge-, un-(æðel-, cyne-),
cuman a-, be-, ge-, of-, to-, cwelan-, dwelan ge-,
-helan for-, niman a-, be-, for-, ge-, -sceran
be-, -stelan be-, for-, ge-, -teran to-.*

The present stem has *e* with umlaut to *y* in 3 singular, *i* in *niman*, *u* in *cuman* with umlaut

to *y*. For *e* we find *æ* once in *forðbæran* 162. The forms are: *forberan* 36, *berenne* 60, *forðberað* I. S. 293, *cwelende* 264, *forhelan* 278, *gestylð* 18; *gecuman* 220, *tocuman* 400, *cum!* I. S. 391, *becume* (subj.) 12, *cymst* 50, *becymst* 424, 462, *cymð* 200, I. S. 362, 525, *becymð* 198, 266, 388, 378, *ofcymð* 16, 372, 510; *niman* I. S. 493, *beniman* 188, *nimð* 376, 354, *genimð* 178, *animað* 182.

The preterit singular 1, 3, has *æ* (*ð*), *a* (*ð*), *o* (*ð*). *bær* 88, *gebær* 38, *bestæl* 466, *totær* 38, *nam* 28, 64, *nám* 28, *com* 16, 66, (twice), etc., I. S. 8 etc., *tocom* 518, *cóm* 180, 236, I. S. 273 etc., *acóm* 170, *becóm* 96 etc.

The 2 sing., the plural and subjunctive preterit have *æ* (*ð*) *a*, *ð*; *totæron* 158, *namon* 66, *cómon* I. S. 344. Isolated is *forhule* (subj.) 446, EARLE'S 'Gloucester Fragments' have the normal *forhæle*.

The past participle *o* and *u*. *Aboren* 524, *geboren* 14, I. S. 427, *unborenum* 512, *æðelboren* 44, *cynboren* 44, *gedwolena* 10, *forholen* 524, *bescoren* 162, *forstolen* 524; *cumen* 524, *fornumen* 164, *fornumene* I. S. 355, *genumen* 16.

CLASS 5.

Biddan *a-*, *ge-*, *-breca* *to-*, *unto-*, *cwæðan* *be-*, *ge-*, *on-*, *wið-*, *etan* *ge-*, *fretan-*, *moð-*, *gifan* *a-*, *for-*, *-gitan* *be-*, *for-*, *on-*, *under-*, *licgan* *for-*, *ge-*, *under-*, *-metan* *wið-*, *seon*⁽¹⁾ *be-*, *for-*, *ge-*, *of-*, *sittan* *be-*, *ge-*, *on-*, *spreca* *for-*, *ge-*, *to-*, *un-*, *picgan*, *-wefan* *a-*, *wreca* *a-*, *ge-*, *wesan*.

In the present stem, except in the 2, 3 singular, the vowel is *e* (*i* in *biddan*, *gifan*, *gitan*, *licgan*, *sittan*, *picgan*; *eo* in *seon*), but *æ* is also frequent. Forms with *e* are: *tobrecan* 406 MS. Junius, *gecwæðan* 448, *cwæðende* 444 Gloucester Fragments, *becwæðe* 408, *et!* 394, *etað* 260, *eton* (subj.) 290, *sprecan* I. S. 503, *sprecande* 78, *gesprecan* 222 MS. U, 406 MS. Junius, *spēcan* 222, B, *sprece* (1) I. S. 149, *sprece* we 286, *sprecað* 12, *wreca* 296, *wrecon* (subj.) 484. Forms with *æ* are: *tobræcan* 286, 406; *cwæðende* 22, 96, 182, 444, *cwæðað* 328, *etað* 358, *spræcan* 18, 122, I. S. 503 M, *gespræcan* 108, 222, 226, 406, *tospræcende* 532, *spræcað* 26, 270, *spræce* (subj.) 390. Forms with *i*:

¹*Seon* occurs but once without a prefix, I. S. 161, *sewene*.

gebiddan 194, *bide!* 80, 400, *gebide!* 68, 202, (the only strong imperatives in *e*) *bidde* we 70, *gebide* (subj. 2) 470; *forgifan* 234, etc., *agif!* 82, *forgif!* 212; *begitan* 196, *forlicgan* 36, *licgende* 32, *licgon* (subj.) 506, *onsittende* 516, *picge* (subj.) 358. For *i* we have *y* in *gyfende* 12, *ongytan* 508, 530, *undergytan* 11, *undergyte* (subj.) 18, *forlycgan* 36. *Seon* has *geston* 526, *geseon* I. S. 74, *forseon* 32, *beseoh!* 78, 312, *geseoh!* 454, 482, *forseo* (1) 176 (twice), 198.

The 2, 3 singular of the present indicative is regularly *i* in all verbs, but *y* is common, and *e*, *æ* also occur. Forms with *i* are: *bitst* 180, 210, *bitt* 370, *bit* 426, *gebit* 484, *cwiðst* 270, *forgifð* 260, etc., *forgit* 12, *lið* 198, 398, 438, *underlið* 20, *gesihð* 12, 202, 338, 372, 376, I. S. 300, *forsihð* 94, 366 (twice), *gesihst* 108, 400, 470, *forsihst* 94, 202; *sit* 268; *spricð* 520. Forms with *y* are: *bytst* 80, *cwyst* 126, *cyst* 200, *cwyðst* 128 C., *cwyð* 372, 504, *yt* 266, 354, *ytt* 272, I. S. 251, *ytst* I. S. 247; *gesyhst* 80, *forsyhð* 412, *sprpçð* 214; Forms with *e* are: *cwæðst* 128 V, *etst* 262, *geetst* I. S. 198, *tospreçð* I. S. 310, *spreçð* 64, 288. Forms with *æ* are: *cwæðst* 128, *tospreçð* I. S. 310 Mb.

The 1, 3 preterit singular is *æ*, also written *ð*, and before *h* and after *g*, *ea*. The only exceptions are *bed* 112, *geset* 222, *breac* 62 V., *nes* (for *ne wæs*) 208. The forms are: *gebæd* 48, *tobræc* 60 *tobræc* 58, *bræc* 62, *cwæð* 30, etc., *becwæð* 428, *gecwæð* I. S. 164, *æt* 164, 392 (twice), I. S. 54, *læg* 146, 154, 156, 162, 180, *lég* 68, *gelæg* 398, *sæt* 284, 314, *sét* 72, *gesæt* 77, 222 U; *spræc* 10, 160, I. S. 503, *gespræc* 26, *gewræc* 276, 300, *gewræc* 296 Faustina A., *wæs* 26, etc., *wæs* 28, 32, 44 (twice), 54, 56 (twice), etc. *ea* occurs in *forgeaf* 318, I. S. 11, *undergeat* I. S. 222, *beseah* I. S. 73, *ofseah* 520, *geseah* 56, *geseah* 32, etc.

The 2 sing., plural and subj. preterit have *æ* (*ð*) usually, *a* before *w*, *ea* after *g*, except *forgefōn* 134; but the plural of *læg* is *lagon*, though the subjunctive is usually *læge*. The forms are: *bædon* 5, *abædon* 118, *gebædon* 496, *bæde* (subj.) 464; *oncwæde* (2) 176, *oncwædon* 492, 494, *cwæde* (subj.) I. S. 169, etc., *æton* 290, *æte* (subj.) 126, *geæte* (2) 230; *læge* (subj.) 234, 508, *lêge* 512, *lagon* (subj.) 92; *sæton* 502, *onsæton* 504; *spræce* (subj.) 390, I. S. 219; *awræce* (subj.) 40, *gewræce* (subj.) 36. *wæron* 26, etc., *wæron* 28, etc., *wære* I. S. 37, etc. *a*

occurs in *lagon* 102, 152, 210, 220, 252, 254, 288, 494, 502, 506, etc. *lagon* 494, 513 (thrice), *lage* (subj.) 234, 234 *U* (twice), *gesawe* (2) 122, *gesawon* 58, etc. *ea* occurs in *forgeafon* 134 C. V. *undergeate* I. S. 206.

The past participle has regularly *e*, for which *æ* is sometimes found, after *g* it has *i*, for which *y* is also used; *brecan* has always *o*, following class 4. (*tobrocene* 294, *untobrocen* 132). With *e*: *gecweden* 358, I. S. 162, etc., *gecwedene* I. S. 118, *freten* 404, *moðfretene* 514, *wiðmeten* 22, *gesewen* 92, 160, *sewene* I. S. 161, *beseten* 190, *gesprecen* 498, *gesprecan* 534, *forsprecan* 512, *awefen* 172, *gewrecen* 404. With *-æ*: *gecwæden* 18, 24, 236, 360, *gecwædene* 18 (twice), *ungesæwenlie* 20. With *i*: *forgifene* 218, *undergiten* I. S. 172. With *y*: *begyten* 524, *ongyten* 520, 530, *forgytene* 510, all, as will be seen, in the 'Seven Sleepers'; see Class 3, I. b.

CLASS 6.

Dragan, *faran for-*, *forð-*, *ge-*, *geond-*, *in-*, *mis-*, *-galan be-*, *-grafan a-*, *hæbban a-*, *hlyhan-*, *-sacan æt-*, *for-*, *wið-*, *-sceaðan a-*, *to-*, *-scyppan ge*, *slean a-*, *ge-*, *of-*, *purh-*, *-spanan a-*, *to-*, *standan a-*, *æt-*, *be-*, *emb-*, *under-*, *wið-*, *steppan fore-*, *forð-*, *swerian*, *þwean a-*, *-wacan a-*, *wescan*, *wexan*.

The present, except in 2, 3 sing. indicative, is regularly *a*. The forms are: *draged* 316, *misfaran* 380, *farande* 410, *farende* 410 Junius, *infarendum* 220, *far!* 226, *farad* 12, *fare* (subj.) 370, *fara* (subj.) 138, *forfare* (subj.) 274, *faran us* 500, *wiðsacan* 72, *wiðsac!* 202, *ætsace* 528, *aspanan* 194, *understanden* 14, *wiðstandan* 294, *embstandenum* 504, *stand!* 150. *æ* occurs in *ahæbban* 310, *ahæbbe* 246, *forðsteppende* 12. *e* occurs in *ofsleh!* 224, *forðsteppende* 14, *wexende* 526. *ea* occurs in *tosceaden* (*forðen?*) 20, *slean* 198, *ofslea* (1) 194, *sleað* 294. *y* in *gescyppan* 18, I. S. 168, etc., *scyppend* 12, etc. *i* occurs for *y* in *gescippene* I. S. 155, *scippend* 20, I. S. 45, *scippende* I. S. 66.

In 2, 3 pres. ind. sing. the vowel is usually *æ*. Cases are: *færst* 346, 462, *færð* 268, 292, 354, 356, 364, I. S. 250, *geondfærð* 18, *ahæfð* 446, *toscæt* 22, *understænt* 22, *forðstæpð* 498. *e* is the regular vowel in *tospend* 72, *stent* 88, 190, 442, 450 (Gloucester MS.), 280, 300, I. S. 102, etc., *understent* 20, 22, etc.,

stend 450, *wexð* 16. Wholly isolated and without analogy in any class is *wiðstandeð* I. S. 229. *y* is found in *gescyppð* 16, *ap̃yhð* (from *þwean*) 272; *i* for *y* in *gescipð* I. S. 99, *ofslihð* 278.

The preterit has *o* or *ð*. The forms are: *drogon* 326, *fór* 488 (twice), 498, *gefór* 320 (except in these three cases *ferde* takes the place of *for* throughout), *begol* 312, *agrófon* 508, *hóf* 106, *ahof* 314, *áhóf* 488, *ahofen* (ind.) 207, *ahofe* 248 (and *ahefde* 284, thrice), *hlóh* 128, *forsóc* 32, *wiðsoc* 174, *wiðsóc* 64, *wiðsocon* 494, *wiðsoce* (subj.) 174, *sloh* 70, 190, 276 (four times), 284, *asloh* 384, *ofslogon* 190, *sloge* 318, *stod* 4, etc., *ætstod* 264, *bestodon* 50, *astodon* 220, *stopon* 504, *forestopon* 114, *swor* 314, *swór* 36, *apwoh* 192, *apwóh* 124, *þwogon* 438, *apwoge* (subj.) 124, *apwogon* (subj.) 168, *awoc* 56, *awóc* 448, 464, *awócon* 516, *woscean* 438 U. *eo* is used for *o* in *gesceop* 6, 12, 14, 130, etc., I. S. 20, etc., *gescēop* 14, 16, 20, 86, *gesceope* 206, I. S. 206, etc., *tospeon* 434, *weox* 40, 434, 476, 322, *weoxon* 124.

The past participle has regularly *a*. The forms are: *gefaran* 156, 488, *agrafen* 528, *agrafene* 98, *ahafen* 56, 340, 384, 400, *wiðsacen* 72, 194, *ofslagen* 114 (twice), 138, 218, 278, 302, 318, 350, 408, 422, 426, 468, 482, I. S. 403, *ofslagan* 276, *purhslagen* 278, *geslagen* 528, *understanden* I. S. 173. *ea* occurs in *asceadene* 496, *gesceapen* 14, 380 (twice), 438, etc., I. S. 47, etc., *gesceapen* I. S. 182 (for *gesceapen*). *æ* occurs in *gestlægene* 524, *ofslægen* 138 C, *ofslægæn* 194. *e* occurs in *ofslegen* 66; *o* in *opwogen* 256.

CLASS 7a.

Feallan a-, *æt-*, *be-*, *to-*, *fon be-*, *ge-*, *on-*, *under-*, *gan a-*, *be-*, *forð-*, *in-*, *of-*, *ut-*, *gangan of-*, *healdan be-*, *ge-*, *-hon a-*, *upa-*, *spannan*, *-wealdan ge*. Present stem. *ea* is used in *ætfeallan* 510, *feald* (3) I. S. 110 (see below), *ætfeallað* 266, *gehealdan* 66, *behealde ge!* I. S. 477, *wealdend* 502, *gewealdend* 502, *ealwealdend* 426, *weallendum* 314. *a* is used in *gangan* 490, *gangende* 206, 302, 396, 408, *gangande* 224, *gang!* 158 (twice), 348, 398, 456, *gange* (subj.) 444, *ofgange* 394, *gangan* (subj.) I. S. 140, elsewhere *gán* is always used, 234, etc., I. S. 246, etc., *forðgán* 530, *ingan* 406, *úrgan* 512, *ofgan* 524, *gað* 14, I. S. 136, *beгаð* 272,

etc., *spannan* 216. *o* is found in *gefon* 416, *onfoh!* 152, 324, *underfoh!* 472, *foð* I. S. 145, *underfó* (subj.) 62, *underfo* (subj.) 306, *underfohð* (3) I. S. 537 (for the regular *-fehð*, see below); *ahon* 48.

The 2, 3 indic. sing. have umlaut of *ea* to *y* and of *o* to *e* and *á* to *æ*. The cases are: *fylð* 12, *befylð* 376 (twice), *underfehð* 72, 128, 328, 510; *gæst* 248, 410, *gæð* 14, etc., I. S. 114, etc., *begæð* 272, 366, 382, *agæð* 372; *hyllt* 272, 446, *behyllt* 348, *wyllt* 416, 478, *gewyllt* 146, 374. Anomalous are: *feald*, *underfohð*, mentioned above, and *underfehð* 16.

The preterit has *eo* except in *fon* and *hon* where *e* is regular and *æ* frequent, *gangan* and *gán* have no preterit. The forms are: *feol* 76, 122, 148, 156, 180, 266, 312, 358, 392, *tofeol* 46, *feoll* 72, 86, 88, 136, 190, 264 (twice), 398, 420, 460, *tofeoll* 48, *ætfeoll* 276, 402, *befeoll* I. S. 63, *befeolle* (subj.) I. S. 62, *heold* 36, *heolde* (subj.) 92, *geweold* 68, 150, *geweolden* (ind.) 218, *weollon* 102, *feng* 140, 390, 398, 400, 412, 516, 534, *fengon* 524, *onfeng* 228, U. B., *befeng* 78, 172, 178, *gefeng* 220, *underfeng* 136, 156, 172, 414, 416, I. S. 73, and 50, 62 V. *fengon* 70 V, *underfengon* 264, *underfenge* (subj.) 84, 220 U, *fencg* 500, 508, *onfencg* 228, *befencg* 248, *underfencg* 384, *underfencge* 220, *onfencgon* 498, *fæng* 32, 44 (twice), 50, 70, *underfæng* 14, *underfænge* 38, 236, *underfæncge* 264. (*æ* is regular up to page 70, and occurs only twice later); *aheng* 256, 220 B. U, *upaheng* 58, *ahengc* 220, *hengc* 492, (the only case where *hon* is used without *a*).

The past participle has *ea* before *l* and *a* before *n*. The forms are: *afeallene* 140, *behealden* 18, *gehealden* 242, I. S. 69 etc.; *befangen* 20, *underfangen* 230, *agáne* 332, *gan* I. S. 463.

CLASS 7b.

-blawan to-, upa-, ut-, -cnawan ge-on-, to-, -drædan on-, lætan a-, for-, to-, -rædan be-, sawan be., to-, slæpan, prawan.

Present and past participle. Before *w*, *a* changes to *æ* in 2, 3 sing. ind.; otherwise *æ* is regular before mutes and *a* before *w*, though *a* and *e* occur anomalously for *æ* in *ondret* (3) 12, and *slæpan* 456, *slápan* 512. The other cases are: *utblawað* 22, *toblawene* 178, *gecnawan* 516, 526 (twice), 534, *ácnawon* 526, *oncnawon* I. S. 321, *to cnawan* 258 I. S. 195, *gecnawe* 526, *gecnawan* (p.p.) 530, *sawende* 320, *sawað* 294, *tosawon* (p.p.) 510, *prawan* 202; *oncnawst* 130, 478, *sæwð* I. S. 262, *besæwð* 362, *ondræt* 228, 266 (The past participle is always weak, *ofdræd* 532, *ofdrædde* 506, 514), *lætan* I. S. 234, *alætan* 394, *læt!* 130, *forlætst* 128, *forlæt* (3) 18, *bæradan* 428 (not in Bosworth as strong or with this meaning), *slæpende* 502, (see above).

The preterit has *eo* before *w* and *e* (with an occasional *æ*) before mutes. The forms are: *upableow* 208, *gecneow* 62, 530, *oncnæow* 40, etc., *gecneowe* 516, 522, 526 (twice), I. S. 276, *seow* 350; *ondred* 522, *ondrædon* 504, *lét* 70, *forlet* I. S. 482, *alæton* 502, *tolete* 504, *slæp* I. S. 214, *slæpon* 502 (twice), 512, etc., *slæpon* 516, *slæpon* (subj.) 506, and with *æ* for *e* *ondræd* 520, *forlæton* I. S. 145, 393.

CLASS 7c.

blowan- ge-, flowan, glowan, growan, rowan, spowan, -swogan ge-, wepan- *hrowan- see hreowan 2.

In the present and past participle the following forms only occur: *blowende* 514, *geblowen* (p.p.) 462, *flowan* I. S. 344, *flowendan* 54, *fleoð* (3) 250,⁽²⁾ *grewð* 104, *geswogen* (p.p.) 264, 460, *bewepen* 108.

The preterit has always *eo*. *fleow* 156, 398, 492, *gleow* 184, *hrowan* (for *rowon*) 436, *speow* 174, 216, *speowe* 196, *weop* 48, 74, 162, *weopon* 478, 490.

CLASS 7d.

hatan be-, ge-, swapan. The forms are: *hætst* 496, *behætst* 200, *hæt* 255, *swæpð* 492, *het* 26, *behel* I. S. 396, *behét* 68, *heton* I. S. 122, *gehaten* 24, etc., I. S. 2, etc., *gehátén* I. S. 6, *gehatene* 22.

CLASS 7e.

beatan of-, -heawan a-, to-, hleapan. The only forms that occur are: *beaton* 98, *beaton* 18, 244, *ofbeatan* 146, *beaton* 482, 486, *toheowe* 46, *leop* 220 (U. *hleop*); *ahæawen* (p.p.) 438.

BENJ. W. WELLS.

Jena, Germany.

² The passage is "*ure blóð fleoð to urum fotum adune.*" Skeat's translation has "our blood fleeth" etc. But the 3 sing. of *fleon* is *flyhð* 18, 334, 372 and for the sense as well as the grammar it is better to take *fleoð*=*flewð*.

THE GERUNDIAL CONSTRUCTION
IN THE ROMANIC LANGUAGES,

IV.

We next come to a third and very frequent use of *aller* with the gerund, in which motion is clearly defined. It belongs, in this sense, then, to the general category of verbs of motion, which may be accompanied by a gerund whose action is subordinate to, or, at most, coördinate with, that of the verb of motion.

Aller.

Sans Pedre sols seguen lo vai,
Quar sua fin veder voldrat.
Passion du Christ, B. 9. 14.
A foc, a flamma vai ardent
Et a gladies persecutan.
Vie de S. Leger, B. 16. 39.

Venir.

Donc vint edrant dreitmant a la mer.
Vie de S. Alexis, B. 21. 38.

Monter, descendre.

Muntent et descendent chantant e esjoï
Li beus angeres du ciel.....
Vie de Saint Auban, 1093.

Passer.

Passastes par Brettaigne d'orient venant.
Ditto, 1127.

S'adresser.

L'enfant ne quaisse ne ne blece,
Fuiant vers un chemin s'adrece.
Crestien de Troies, B. 145. 15.

Reparier.

Et li altre s'en reparierent fuiant arriere en l'ost.
Ville-Hardouin, ch. XXI.

Tourner.

Sun petit pas s'en turnet cancelant.
Ch. de Roland, 2227.
Quand paiens virent Gormund mort,
Fuiant s'en tournent vers le port.
Gormund and Isembard, 421 (Rom. St. III. 562).

Entrer.

Main a main entrent dedans lor chiés saignant.
Amis et Amiles, B. 62. 11.

Saillir.

E cil de Roem saillent l'uns l'autre sumunant.
Roman de Rou, 3236.

Issir.

Richart ist de la vile sur son cheval curant.
Ditto, 3246.

Accourir.

Kar de Roem acurent burgeis e paisant,
Macues e gulsarmes e haches aportant.
Ditto, 4093.

Estordre (=chapper).

E Normant lur estordent "Dieu aie" criant.
Ditto, 3235.

Encalcer.

Vers Saraguce les encalcent ferant,
A colps pleniens les en vunt ociant.
Ch. de Roland.

Sourdre.

Par la priere Auban est surse du pendant
Funtainne freide e clere à grand ruisel curant.
Vie de S. Auban, 1167.

Apparaitre.

Angeres i aparurent à clerc voiz chantant.
Ditto, 1182.

It is useless to add more to this list; for constructions of this kind are so often met, that I believe it would not be a rash statement to say that about four-fifths of all the examples of the gerund without *en* will be found to be accompanied with a verb of motion. To see how the proportion would stand, I have counted the examples in several characteristic works. It will be observed that some authors are much fonder of this mode of thought-expression than others. The figures indicate the number of times the construction occurs with the verbs they follow.

Voyage de Charlemagne (860 lines). Tourner, 2; remeindre, 1; trouver, 2; aller, 6; voir, 1; tenir, 1; venir, 1; absolute(?) 2.

Chanson de Roland (4002 lines). Aller, 28; venir, 1; absolute(?), 1; mourir, 2; tourner, 1; encalcer, 1.

Roman d'Aquin (3087 lines). Tourner, 2; aller, 30; voir, 1; gesir, 1; venir, 1.

Berte aus Grans Piés (3482 lines). Faire, 1; aller, 2; trouver, 1; venir, 1.

Flor et Blanceflor (3342 lines). Aller, 8; venir, 2.

H. de Valenciennes (Hist. de l'Empereur Henri). Envoyer, 1; aller, 7; venir, 1; chevaucher, 1; absolute(?).

Guiot de Provins (La Bible). Aller, 4.

Traduction de Guil. de Tyr. Courir, 1; mener, 1; chevaucher, 1; prendre, 1; trebucher, 1; venir, 11; faire, 2; suivre, 3; absolute(?), 11; fuir, 1; instrumental, 3; trouver, 1; retourner, 4; oir, 1; aller, 11; chasser, 1; mourir, 1.

Vie de Saint Auban (1845 lines). Venir, 2; aller, 21; gesir, 1; absolute(?), 3; remeindre, 1; resplendir, 1; oir, 1; trouver, 3; passer, 1;

laisser, 1; voir, 1; surdre, 1; aparaistre, 1; faillir, 1.

Ville-Hardouin (La Conquete de Constantinoble). Reparier, 1; aller, 7; venir, 3; tourner, 1; envoyer, 1; absolute(?), 2.

De Joinville (Hist. de Saint Louis). Venir, 6; trouver, 2; aller, 2; faire, 1; as adverb, 1; sentir, 1; absolute(?), 2.

Aiol et Mirabel (10,985 lines). Aller, 68; venir, 9; oir, 1; encaucher, 1; absolute(?), 2; tourner, 2; fuir, 1; par, 1.

It seems almost superfluous to cite examples from the other languages, as this French construction is universally current throughout the whole Romanic group. That, however, nothing may be taken on faith, I give a few from hundreds of examples noted, remarking that I have been struck with the more frequent occurrence of the construction in early French and Provençal, especially with *aller* and *venir*, than in any of the others.

Proven. al.

Laisse loill, e per nulla re
No venga ves lui trop corren.
Daude de Pradas, B. 177. 32.

Car ço es pessamentz confus
Que ven en cor aissi corren.
Ditto, El Romanz, l. 49 (Stickney's ed).

Un bon juzieu que aquo auzi,
Tantost corren d'aquí parti.
B.'s Denkm. ler, XXXIX. p. 274.
E Peire Vidals s'en isset fugen.

Bib. der Troub. XXII.

Italian.

Salian scherzando i pargoletti amori.
Ariosto, sonetto.
E quando a morte deseando corro.

Petrarca.

Ch'io mi parti'sbigottito fugendo.
Guido Cavalcanti.

Chiara fontana ancor surgea d'un monte
Mormorando con aqua dolce e fresca.
Tasso, Gerus. Conquist. XV. 44.

E che accorrer potea un giorno
Camminando alla bufera.
Giorgi Bertola.

Spanish.

Los males vienen corriendo
Jorge Manrique.

La olvidada infanta Urraca
Vertiendo l grimas entra.
Rom. del Cid, p. 96. (Voegelin).

De zamora sale Dolfos
Corriendo y apresurado.
Ditto, p. 152.

La picó, sacó miel, fuése volando.

Luis Martin.

Portuguese.

..... e as terras viciosas
De Africa e de Asia andavam devastando.
Camoens, Os Lus. I. 2.

Pizando o crystallino céo formoso
Vem pela Via Latea.....
Ditto, I. 20.

Mas o animal atreço nesse instante
.....
Bramando duro corre.....
Ditto, I. 78.

Wallachian.

Că Jonană a venit în nice mâncându-nice bândă
Math. XI. 18.

Vine alergând pe scenă cu un snop de burnene în
mână.

V. Alecsandri, Mama Anghelusa.
Halmana în costum de Iarna trece ținând o valiză.
Ditto, Halmana.

With verbs of motion there may be, in general, two kinds of construction in conjunction with other verbs: namely, that already illustrated, in which the gerund accompanies the finite verb; and a second, in which the infinitive is used with or without a preposition. The latter use of the infinitive is by far the more common. In either case, that is, whether the preposition be used or not, the verb of motion expresses the purpose to be accomplished by the concomitant infinitive. The distinction in shade of meaning is usually this: when the idea of purpose is strongly implied, the preposition serves to give prominence to the purpose; whereas the preposition is omitted when the purpose is not conspicuous. We may illustrate this by the sentences: Je vais au théâtre m'amuser tous les soirs, and je vais au théâtre tous les soirs non-seulement pour m'amuser mais aussi pour observer et pour apprendre—a distinction, which we should secure in English by: *for the purpose of* or by the simple infinitive with *to*, according as we did, or did not, desire to emphasize the purpose.

La fame Amile a la clere fason
Estoit alee por faire s'orison.
Amis et Amiles, B. 61. 37.

Abtant se volgran acordar
Qual duy pogram anar veser
La donzela, e per saber
Si sa beutatz era tan grans.
Guillem de la Bara (Meyer, Recueil, p. 128.)

This reference to the infinitive construction with a verb of motion has been made, in order to lead up to the consideration of certain cases in which the infinitive and gerund touch each other so nearly, in point of use and signification, that they become virtual equivalents.

1. Il se relieve a grant paine
Par grant aïr le va requerre.
Roman de Renart, B. 213. 9.
2. Quant il nous virent, il nous vindrent
sus courre.
Joinville, Hist. de S. Louis, ch. XLVI.
3. Aisi se van ferir cum cascus venc
No lor valo escut pur un besenc.
G. de Rossilho, 2180.
4. L'effant Jhesus i ameneron,
Ad Arian lo prenteront.
Pueis van li dire e pregar,
Que l'effant volgues essenhar.
B.'s Denkmüller, xxxix. p. 273.
5. * Arian vai li demandar:
Mon effant, ar digas aleph
E en apres tu diras beph.
Ditto, p. 273.
6. Grans maravilhas se doneron,
Per la vila s'en van cridan.
Ditto, p. 274.
7. E totz los juzieus van cridar:
Ailas caitiu! e que ferem
Ni qual cosselh penre porem?
Ditto, p. 292.
8. E en apres el manda diire als mainaders
Ex als baros de Fransa ez als sieus logadiers.
Chanson de la Croisade des Albigeois, 8,412.
9. E mandet dire a nUgo de la signa que
vengues a Usercha en un borc on estava en
Gaucelm Faidit.

Bib. der Troub. XL.

10. Volga la vista desiosa e lieta
Cercandomi

Petrarca.

11. Mandó il cavaliere all'albergo della
corona, sappiendo (=ad informarsi) se era suo
famiglio.

Franco Sacchetti.

12. E estando de fora, enviarão a elle cha-
mando-o.

Marcos, III. 31.

13. Os Portuguezes somos do Occidente,
Imos buscando as terras do Oriente.
Os Lus. I. 50.

14. Que tempo concertado e ventos tinha
Para ir buicando o Indo desejado.

Ditto, I. 95.

15. Și neaflându-lă, s'ați întorsă la Jerusa-
limă cântându-lă.

Luca, II. 45.

16. Porque viene mi nifa
Cogiendo flores.

Anonymous, 15th cent.

The first of the examples is not very decid-
ed, for although, as the context shows, Dans
Constanz, considering his position, does not
have to "go" in order to strike Isengrin, *va
requerre* may express future, rather than pro-
gressive, action. Still there can be no doubt
but that, in accordance with the freedom, I
might almost say, looseness, of the gerundial
construction at this time, the author, if push-
ed for a rime, would not have scrupled to use,
all the circumstances and situations remaining
the same, the gerund as an equivalent for the
infinitive, without feeling he was guilty of any
grammatical negligence. A part of this re-
mark might apply to the quotation from
Girart de Rossilho; but the passage shows
rather that *van ferir* means that the knights
continue the fight, "cum cascus venc;" i. e.
van is subordinate to *ferir*, in other words,
copulative; so that the same nuance of
thought might have been rendered by *van
feren*.

In No. 2, it is plain that *courant* substituted
for *courre* would not vary, in the slightest
degree, the thought, which is: they came
rushing upon us. The first two lines of No.
4 inform us that the parents of Jesus were
already in the presence of Arian. It can not,
therefore, be said of them literally *van, they
go*; nor can *van dire* etc., be explained here
as future. Being already before Arian, they
speak to him and request him to undertake
the instruction of their son; or they *go on
telling* their story and *requesting* him, etc.

No. 5 contains a still more decided instance
of the copulative use of *anar*; as *vai li deman-
dar* means *li demanda* and nothing more. In
modern French *venir* is sometimes used in
very nearly the same way: Un sourire livide
vient glacer ses traits. (*Le Français*, Boston,
vol. i, p. 55).

A comparison of 6 and 7, taken in connex-
ion with the passages in which they occur,
shows the same approximation in thought-
shading, of *s'en van cridan* and *van cridar*;

the difference, if any, is very slight. So *manda diire* and *mandet dire*, in the two following examples, are seen to be modes of expression analogous to: *mandet disen*, *pregan* in: E tan tost com el fo vengutz el mandet disen al Dalfil et al comte Guion que ill li deguessen ajudar, Bib. der Troub. XIV.; in: elli mandet pregan qu'el fezes si qu'el fezes mudar los edificis, ditto, B. 241, 15; to: mandó sappiendo (No. 11); and to the Portuguese: enviarão chamando (No. 12). The Wallachian and Spanish would likewise use the gerund here after the verb *to send*. And so Henri de Valenciennes, in the work already quoted (ch. IV), uses *envoyer*: Et envoierent lor archiers huant et glatissant et faisant une noise. Cf. also *Romania* VIII, 90: Je me levoy un matin au jort prenant, Envoy m'en en un giardin la flor culhant. In modern French also the gerund after this same verb, as well as after other verbs of motion, is allowable to express a purpose, although the infinitive is more common, in accordance with a general preference which the Frenchman entertains for the infinitive construction, where no ambiguity arises by its use.*

M. de Freycinet a appris qu'une note, émanant du ministère de l'intérieur, avait été envoyé disant que M. de Freycinet avait capitulé.

Courrier des Etats Unis.

J'eus peur d'avoir senti la peur une fois, et prenant mon sabre, caché sous mon bras, j'entraî le premier brusquement donnant l'exemple à mes grenadiers.

A. de Vigny.

Aétius avait déjà dépêché ses courriers dans toute la Gaule et chez les peuples alliés, les invitant à s'unir à lui.

Le Beau.

C'est le voyageur que nous avons vu tout à l'heure errer cherchant un gîte.

V. Hugo.

It is not possible to interpret these gerunds otherwise than as expressing a purpose; for in some of them the infinitive with *pour* could be substituted; and in the others, while in

*Il est dans le génie de la langue française de préférer l'infinitif à tout autre mode, quand la clarté de la phrase n'en est pas altérée.—BOREL.

their present shape this substitution could hardly be made, its exclusion would be more owing to the cacophony that would thereby arise than to any forbidding principle of grammar. In the case of the first and last sentence, a well-educated Frenchman, if asked why not use *pour dire* and *pour chercher*, would likely answer: C'est l'harmonie de la phrase qui exige le gérondif (participle), as *l'harmonie* is the universal retreat behind which Frenchmen take shelter, when brought face to face with a knotty point of grammar.

The gerunds in 10, 15, 16 may as legitimately be regarded as expressing a purpose as coincident or progressive action, and the thought would not be materially changed, if they were converted into the infinitive construction. We see this well illustrated in the two remaining examples (13 and 14), which do not differ essentially in signification, since the *purpose* of the going, in both cases, is to look for India.

From the foregoing reasoning we gather that, after a verb of motion, the infinitive or gerund may take the place of a final dependent clause.

Here belong also certain verbs, which, while they are not verbs of motion, are accompanied by verbals in *-ant* which serve to complete, in a manner, the predication of the principal verb. They may, in most cases, be resolved into adverbial phrases.

Car mi fil sont ocis et mort saignan.

Amis et Amiles, B. 62. 37.

A peine chaut remeint li quors en piz batant.

Vie de S. Auban, 844.

Je li lo bien qu'elle vos maint tariant.

Jeu-parti, B. 341. 16.

Murut subitement seant sus une sele.

Berte aus Grans Piés, 2073.

Lo coms G. e ilh seu s'en van dolen,

E lhi baro de K. restan ploran.

G. de Rossilho, 5340.

SAMUEL GARNER.

Annapolis, Md.

THE USE OF THE FEMININE in the Romance Languages, to express an indefinite neuter.

Among the many interesting linguistic phenomena with which the reading of Romance

texts makes us familiar, may be mentioned the use of the feminine form of the pronoun or adjective to give succinct expression to some idea not otherwise clearly indicated. This construction is sometimes, and perhaps not unhappily, described as the "indefinite neuter." We find examples of it scattered through all the Romance languages in their older periods, and some have survived and appear to have become crystallized in modern speech. A satisfactory explanation of the usage has not yet been offered, most of the authorities contenting themselves with a bare mention of the fact, if indeed they do not pass it over in silence.

DIEZ, 'Grammatik der Romanischen Sprachen,' vol. iii, p. 48, in calling attention to the fact, cites cases mostly drawn from Tobler (see below).

BLANC, 'Italiänische Grammatik,' p. 272, referring to Italian says, "es ist jetzt unendlich gewöhnlich, den Gegenstand wovon die Rede ist, oder das leicht zu supplirende Object des Satzes, durch 'la' auszudrücken. Auf diese Weise sind nun eine grosse Menge Redensarten entstanden." He of course makes no suggestion explanatory of the usage.

TOBLER, *Jahrbuch*, viii, 338, gives some interesting examples, and remarks simply that "eine solche Verwendung von 'la' [the personal pronoun] nicht gegen den Geist der (französischen) Sprache ist."

BRUNOT, 'Grammaire Historique de la langue française,' p. 231, merely alludes to the frequency of the phenomenon in Old French and mentions cases of the survival of the usage in the modern language. Quoting the example "c'est la voire" and others similar, he adds: "Il n'y a point de substantif féminin sous-entendu; le féminin représente tout simplement une forme neutre qui manquait."

An explanation frequently offered is that a feminine noun was formerly expressed but, falling itself into desuetude, disappeared, leaving the impress of its gender upon the word which remains behind to represent it. This is, however, far from being a satisfactory, or at least a sufficient explanation, inasmuch as the feminine frequently refers to a wholly indefi-

nite antecedent or circumstance, or to an antecedent which embraces a whole set of circumstances, as may be seen from the examples cited later.

This construction is the more interesting as in the old stages of the languages the regular usage required, theoretically at least, as we should naturally have expected, the neuter, although practically the masculine was used. In the 'Donatz Proensals,' e. g., (v. E. Stengel, 'Die beiden ältesten provenzalischen Grammatiken,' Marburg, 1878, p. 2) we read: "Neutris es aquel que no perte al un ni al autre [i. e. masculine or feminine], si cum "gauç. i. gaudium," e "bes. i. bonum." Mas aici no sec lo uulgars la gramatica els neutris substantius, ans se diçen aici com se fossen masculis, si cum aici "grans es los bes que aquest ma fait," e "grans es lo mals que mes uengutz de lui." We are still able to trace cases of this neuter use (which of course became later regularly masculine); e. g. in the 'Chanson de Roland' we have the line: "Il est jugiet que nus les ocirum," in which the form "jugiet" is neuter. In view of this regular usage a special explanation would seem to be required for the use of the feminine.

The following examples have been collected, and it is believed that a continued examination would show the phenomenon to be more common than is usually supposed.

French.

- "Ne pot estre altre." (Alexis, 156).
- "Li a tele donnée." (Renaus de Montauban, 429. 11.)
- "Jà altre n'en ferons." (Renaus de Montauban, 191. 21.)
- "Ceste m'a il bastie." (Renaus de Montauban, 365. 19.)
- "Enmi le piz li dona tel." (Chevalier au Lyon, 4192.)
- "Et il l'en ra une donee tel." (Chevalier au Lyon, 4208.)
- "Ceste arons nous tost prouvé."
- "Onques mais n'oi tel."
- "C'est la voire." (Brunot, 231.)
- "Il lui en a une portée"=il lui a porté un coup. (Brunot, 231.)
- "Il l'eut bonne." (Brunot, 231.)

"Vous me la baillez bonne." (Brunot, 231.)
 "Sire, voire: fait li quens." ('Aucassin et Nicolette, '1062.)
 "Ja ceste n'avenra."
 "Ja ceste n'est pensée."
 "Sire, dist il, ne peut autre estre."
 "De moult grande s'est escapés."
 "Ceste vos iert molt chier vendue."

Compare also, "l'échapper belle," "la donner belle," "la payer," etc. Further cases might without difficulty be added.

In the Anmerkung to p. 95 "des Provenzalischen Alexanderliedes" (Germania, 1857), Tobler has collected a number of examples, the majority of which, however, might be as well explained as feminines.

Italian.

The use of "nulla" is of course very common in this sense, and was so already among the *trecentisti*; v. Petrarca, Canzoni 9,4; 7,48; 10,75, etc., etc.

"Poi disse, bene ascolta chi la nota." (Dante, Inferno xv, 99.)

"Cessâr le sue opere bieche Sotto la mazza d'Ercole, che forse Gliene diè cento, e non sentì le diece." (Dante, Inferno xxv, 33.)

"Di sorta glien'ho data una." (Cesari, Nov. 28.)

"Ella (the matter) non andrà così." (Boccaccio, 9. 5.)

"La, non andrà così."

"Non posso capirla."

"Io per me non la intendo."

"La capite o non capite?"

"Passarsela bene o male."

"Farla ad uno."

"Accoccarla ad uno."

"Affibbiarla ad uno."

"Menarla buona ad uno."

"Pagarla cara," "Scamparla," "Dirla schietta," "Romperla con qualcuno," etc., etc.

Spanish regularly shows the use of the neuter pronoun; "lo" being used to represent a phrase or idea to which gender cannot be assigned, whereas we have seen the Italian is very liable to use the feminine "la." Cases of the use of the feminine however occur.

"Ahora lo tendras hecho un almibar, pero luego sera ella." (Knapp, Spanish Readings 63.2)

"Hum! ya la tenemòs." (Knapp, Spanish Readings 61.8.)

Roumanian.—Diez says that "auch der Dacoromane Feminina in neutralem Sinne angewendet;" besides which this language has the further peculiarity that it expresses the Latin neuter of the plural by means of the feminine of the same number. E. g., "toate sunt gata"="omnia sunt parata;" "vorbi multe"="multa loqui;" whereas the other Romance languages can only do this with the assistance of an added substantive, as in Provençal: "totas causas"="omnia."

A phenomenon similar in character to those mentioned is the use of certain feminine substantive-pronouns, relating both to persons and things, as masculines. Diez refers to this. Examples, some of which are exceedingly common, are: "personne ne sera assez hardi;" "rien n'est bon," "on m'a dit quelque chose qui est très plaisant;" *Old Italian*: "nulla cosa è tanto gravoso" (see "I poeti del primo secolo" 1, 82); *Old Portuguese*: "Algun rem" (v. F. Sant. 545); *Prov.* "ren que bom sia" (Raynouard, Choix III, 330); "re nascut" (v. Gérard de Roussillon, 4087).

T. McCABE.

Johns Hopkins University.

The Gospel according to Saint Matthew in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions. A new edition, edited for the Syndics of the University Press by REV. WALTER W. SKEAT. Cambridge, 1887.

PROFESSOR SKEAT, in his Preface, describes the difference between the self-imposed duties of an editor now and when KEMBLE and HARDWICK edited this Gospel for the University Press some thirty years ago. He says: "To put it in the most striking manner, we may say that an editor's duty at the present moment is supposed to consist in an endeavour to represent the peculiarities of the MSS. in the most exact and accurate manner; he is

expected to assume that the Scribes meant what they wrote, and he must not venture to make any correction without giving due notice. It might be thought that such a proceeding is simple and obvious; but it is quite certain that such was not what was expected of an editor thirty or forty years ago. On the contrary, he was then expected to *edit* his MS.; and this meant, that he was to *modernise* the MS. in every conceivable way, by the use of every method which his ingenuity could suggest. He was not to reproduce the MS. as it stood, but only as it might be supposed to stand after being so altered as to make it acceptable to a modern reader. PROFESSOR SKEAT then goes on to note the arbitrariness of KEMBLE and HARDWICK's procedure, 1. in the use of capital letters; 2. in punctuation; 3. in the use of *v* and *j*; 4. in ignoring contractions; 5. in the careless reproduction of MS. accents; 6. in the employment of *p* and *ð*.

In all these respects the new edition is indeed a vast improvement upon the old. How numerous and important are the changes may be gathered from a collation of the first page of the new edition with the corresponding portion of the old. At the beginning of the new occurs this statement: [Leaf 1 of the Lindisfarne MS. is blank; on the reverse of the leaf is a geometrical pattern]; this is omitted in the old. Before Latin title: [Leaf 2], new; omitted in old. In Latin title: *X*. new; *decem*, old. In Northumbrian title: *rim*, old; *rím*, new. Immediately under title: [Epistola beati Hieronymi ad Damasum Papam, in quattuor Evangelistas.] [Beatissimo Papæ Damaso, Hieronymus.]; omitted in new. L. 1: *writta*, old; *wuritta*, new. L. 3: *sundrude*, old; *sundrade*, new. L. 4: Latin text: *præsumtio*, old; *præsumptio*, new. Ib.: *cæteris*, old; *ceteris*, new. L. 6: *l* twice, omitted in old. L. 7: *gefulden*, old; *gefalden* new. L. 8: *hwgenæ*, old; *hwgna* (altered from *hwgnæ*) new. Ib.: *l* omitted in old. Ib.: *me*, old; *meh*, new. L. 7: Latin text: *saliva*, old; *saliba*, new. L. 9: *l* twice omitted in old. L. 10: *l* omitted in old. L. 11: *setnessa* old; *setness*, new. L. 12: Latin text: *adhibita*, old; *adhibenda*, new. L. 13: *l* omitted in old. Ib. Latin text: [*enim*] in old; omitted in new. To these changes must be added all

those included under the first, second and fourth heads above, and a number of footnotes indicating expunctions, corrections, and marginal additions in the MS., words there written in red ink, and the point at which the front of leaf 2 is replaced by the back. This is a goodly array of corrections, though it does not include all that PROFESSOR SKEAT might have given, if I may trust my own collation, made in 1882.

To exhibit the possible margin of error in the printed text, as compared with the MS., I append a list of the discrepancies between PROFESSOR SKEAT's readings and my own, covering the various prefaces to the Gospel, pp. 1-23.

I am far from assuming that all these represent errors of PROFESSOR SKEAT's. Even supposing that half of them do, there is still proof enough that the edition is tolerably correct. I designate his reading by S, and mine by C, and wherever possible give page and line according to the new edition.

Title: *regultra*, S; *regoltra*, C. 12: *betwih*, S; *bitwih*, C. 15: *to onginnum* in red ink, C. 19: *hwelc*, S; *hwelc*, C. 111 (margin): *hewere*, S; *hewene*, C. 113: final *e* of *monige* added in red ink, C. 28: *nan*, S; *nañ*, C. 212: *noma*, S; *noma*, C. 217: *criecna*, S; *creicna*, C. 34: *gedryhton*, S; *gedryhton*, C. 39: *giblonde*, S; *geblonden*, C. 43: *ærest*, S; *acrest*, C. 511: *gaast*, S; second *a* expuncted, C. 78: *netra*, S; *netna*, C. 713: *gearwas*, S; *gearrwas*, C. 83: *glaesen*, S; *glaeren*, C. 87: *wæs*, S; *wæs*, C. 92: *for*, S; *fore*, C. 911: *odðer*, S; *odðer*, C. 916: *hwelcum*, S; *hwelcum*, C. 147: *cnearesu*, S; *cneuresu*, C. Ib.: *siæ*, S; *się*, C. 1414: *enne*, S; *æne*, C. 168: *faestern*, S; *faestern*, C. 1614: *cwoðend*, S; *cwoðend*, C. 173: *geornnisse*, S; *geornisse*, C. 1714: *ðæm*, S; *ðæm*, C. 1716: *god*, S; *gode*, C. 1719: *ofer*, S; *ofer*, C. 1811: *hælendes*, S; *hælendes*, C. 1911: *betwih*, S; *bitwih*, C. 213: *gewurpp*, S; *gewarpp*, C. 214: I would read *driu*, corrected to *drig*. 2115: *monigfullice*, S; *monigfallice*, C. 226: *sægde*, S; *sægde*, C.

Of these 111, *hewene*; 217, *creicna*; 34, *gedryhton*; 78, *netna*; 83, *glaeren*; 147, *cneuresu*; 1414, *æne*; 213, *gewarpp*; 2115, *monigfallice*, are of some importance.

PROFESSOR SKEAT's statements are now

and then too sweeping. Thus, he remarks in the preface: "The scribe of the Lindisfarne MS. never employs the letters *v* or *j*." Besides seeming to settle off-hand the question whether a variety of hands were employed on the gloss, thus apparently contradicting his own opinion as expressed in the Preface to John's Gospel, p. viii, he ignores the fact, patent to all, that there is a *v* on the very first page of his editing, *onginnum*, 1⁵, and two more on the second, *vurit*, 2¹⁵, and *vrill*, 2¹⁸.

But it would be cavilling to dwell so long upon these matters as to obscure the fact that this is, in general, a good edition, if by that we are to understand the faithful transcript of a text or texts. Upon this, with whatever emendations may finally be necessary in detail, the investigations of scholars may safely be based.

ALBERT S. COOK.

University of California.

Florian's Fables: selected and edited for the use of schools by the REV. CHARLES YELD, M. A., Head Master of University School, Nottingham, etc.: [In Macmillan's Illustrated Primary Series; Edited by G. EUGÈNE-FASNACHT, etc.]

This is a beautiful and thoroughly unique little book. "Infinite riches in a little room" is a not inapt description of it. Within the limits of 100 open, clear, and beautifully printed 16mo pages, it contains twenty of FLORIAN's best Fables, each with an appropriate introduction, and with full notes and vocabularies; a series of twenty well-constructed exercises for translation into French, paraphrasing each of the Fables; twenty dialogues, based on the same; a full alphabetical list of irregular verbs in their principal parts, and a complete index: to which are to be added a scholarly historical introduction, and ten very amusing pictures—all for forty cents! So much that is good and pretty, for so little money, it would be hard to find in any other book.

Yet when we come to define the little volume more closely we confess to some hesitation and uncertainty. The main title informs us that it is for the use of schools, by a Head Master, with philological and

explanatory notes, etc: yet it belongs to the "Illustrated Primary Series." To satisfy both these views in so brief a space was perhaps impossible; so there has been a division, with the advantage decidedly against the primary view. The pictures are indeed "primary," and will vastly entertain the little ones—while they are good enough also to amuse bigger children too. But all the rest of the book—except perhaps the text itself—lies outside of what we should call primary work. The notes "philological and explanatory" are on a higher plane of scholarship, and are indeed excellent for even advanced schools. The vocabularies—one for each fable—are etymological throughout, and imply a fair knowledge of Latin. The exercises and dialogues, and indeed the whole apparatus except the pictures, contradict the presumption that the book is intended by the editor for the use of children in the primary study of French. Hence the little book, small as it is, may have some difficulty in settling down into its proper place: indeed, this writer is quite inclined to give it a trial with a class of collegians who would be deeply insulted at being called "primary." Seriously, we fear that the pictures—pretty as they are—and the "Primary" title will cause this excellent little book to be misunderstood and underrated. We commend it, therefore, to the personal inspection of our colleagues, for schools and lower college classes.

But with all its merits, the *best thing* in it is a passage from the otherwise scholarly introduction, on the Relation of French to Latin, which passage we cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of giving, entire, to those unsuspecting speakers and writers of "the American dialects" who read the MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES. Many strange things have appeared in the NOTES, but nothing stranger than this!

"One might hint at a parallel which seems to exist in the revolt of the American colonies from the sovereignty of Britain, and the effect of this revolt upon the American dialect: more startling in some respects than the change from classical Latin to Old French. Hundreds of words have been invented and have found a home in America, which are, to say the least, extraordinary. Every one knows the *strong preterites* in the stanza—

'As stealthily to steal he stole,
His chink he softly chunk;
And many a leary smile he smole,
And many a wink he wunk.'

It is to be hoped they may never be used otherwise than by way of joke—to show what *Red Republicanism in letters* will condescend to: but remembering by what subtle and unperceived stages of attachment words worm themselves into the diction and grammar of a language, one cannot help wondering what the American dialects will grow to, under the liberty of invention and alteration which every American citizen claims as his heritage in literature as in all else. The "Queen's English" may some day become almost as unintelligible to our American cousin as the Carolingian Latin is to the modern Parisian."

EDWARD S. JOYNES.

South Carolina College.

LANGUAGE AND DIALECT IN GERMAN.

*Schriftsprache und Dialekte im Deutschen
nach Zeugnissen alter und neuer Zeit.*
Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen
Sprache von A. SOCIN. 544 pages.

This is a very large book, containing almost no new and original investigations. Two-thirds of it is made up of quotations from documental sources; from early grammarians and from many authors whose views are quoted or paraphrased on some of the most knotty and still unsettled questions in the history of the German language, and concerning the nature of language in general, of a literary language, and of a dialect. Where SOCIN adduces "Zeugnisse," often new ones found by himself, from original documents, rare tracts and books of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, his compilation is very valuable even to the specialist. But the book runs in a popular vein in part, and is even sensational, e. g. such words as "Sprachenhass, Verzweiflungskampf" of dialects do not belong to the scientific vocabulary. The author apologizes frankly for any prejudice in favor of his native dialect, the Alemannic.

One is tempted to say of SOCIN's book what the London *Academy* said of SKEAT's 'Principles of English Etymology,' "It is hard to tell for whom the book is intended." Its possible value to the philologist is indicated above. Its chief end, I venture to say, is to furnish

the teachers of German at the 'Gymnasium,' 'Realschule' and at foreign institutions from the High School to the University, with a history of the German language; but the book can hardly be called 'Contributions' to such a history. Its main subject is the origin of the written language and its relation to the dialects in the different historical periods. It does for the teacher who has not all the 'Hülfsmittel' at command in the history of the language and the dialects, what the new editions of HEYSE's, BECKER's and BLATZ's large grammars are intended and able to do for him in the field of grammar. Only the last revisers of HEYSE and BECKER should have left the old rut enough to put the treatment of the sounds in a separate chapter called "phonology;" and BLATZ should recognize that *a, i, u* are not the only primitive vowels. SOCIN's book and the grammars just mentioned, are essentially teachers' aids. I doubt that even an advanced student will come to the surface having once plunged into such a book.

Very interesting reading are the last 200 pages, which treat of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The appendix has a special chapter on JACOB GRIMM and one on the grammatical theories of the author about the relation of written language to dialect (romantic point of view); on those of HUMBOLDT, HEYSE, BECKER (metaphysical point of view); on those of RAUMER and WACKER-NAGEL (pedagogical and provincial); on those of SCHLEICHER, who looks upon language as a living organism; on those of RÜCKERT and SCHERER (aesthetic and political point of view); finally, on those of the "Junggrammatiker," as SOCIN chooses to call a certain number of progressive and energetic investigators, who are supposed to be bigotted worshippers of Sound and of the principle of Analogy—"the heavenly maid," as an old believer calls his idol, Parataxis. The résumé of certain chapters of PAUL's 'Principien der Sprachgeschichte' given by SOCIN, and SIEVERS' article in the 'Encyclopaedia Britannica' under "Philology," will do much to scatter the pernicious germs of modern philology in Germany, England and America.

On the theories as to the origin of written

languages in general, the nature of dialects, on the Frankish Court language during the Old High German period, on the one literary language of the Middle High German period, SOCIN quotes the various opinions directly from the authors, or presents them in his own words—which is quite impartially done. His position is the comfortable one of MONTAIGNE "Que sais-je?" A non-believer in the existence of the one Middle High German written language, must be puzzled, yet pleased, by the heading of the second chapter of the first book: "Die mittelhochdeutsche Schriftsprache," and of the third chapter of the same book: "Das Wiederaufleben der Schrift-dialekte im 14ten Jahrhundert." What a short-lived affair must have been that "allgemeine Hof- und Dichtersprache, die durch ihren Einfluss auf die Prosa zur mittelhochdeutschen Schriftsprache sich erweitert und als solche in Niederdeutschland, theilweise auch in den Niederlanden, Geltung erlangt" (p. 112). In the thirteenth century it is a great institution, in the fourteenth occurs its complete disintegration. In the fifteenth century, the struggle of the dialects and that of the various "Kanzleisprachen" with one another and with the dialects were resumed, struggles that were to last three hundred years.

SOCIN calls Middle High German a literary language, Middle German, a literary dialect (p. 116). Does M. H. G. here include 'Oberdeutsch' (South German) and Middle German, as it generally does? If so, it is a misstatement, not original with SOCIN.—For a popular book, the author's style is very clumsy.

H. C. G. BRANDT.

Hamilton College.

Von Luther bis Lessing von F. KLUGE, Strassburg. Trübner. 1888.

This taking title belongs to a collection of philological essays, disconnected, but all dealing with certain important points in the New High German period of the language. "Dies Büchlein will keine deutsche Sprachgeschichte sein; zur Beruhigung fachwissenschaftlicher Gemüter sei es gesagt," says the author in the preface. But I venture to say, that if we are to have a history of the German language

we would rather have it from the author of the Etymological Dictionary with its excellent historical introduction than from anybody else.

The essays are written with a view to interest a larger public. In the unpretending book is a great deal of research that has yielded new points of view and new facts, hidden under a genial popular treatment. In the chapter on the South and Middle German word-stock, are some interesting and very valuable comparative word-lists chosen from various bible texts. They are in fact concordances of the early bible translations. No history of the language has ever so fully and correctly presented the relation of Latin to the literary language and to the dialects as is done in the chapters, "The Language of the church and of the People;" "Latin and Humanism." In the essay "Luther and the German Language," KLUGE cannot be blamed for a little hit at SCHERER's periods of three hundred years in the history of German literature. The contents of the rest of the book are indicated by the chapter-headings: "MAXIMILIAN and his 'Kanzlei';" "Authors and Printers;" "Literary Language and Dialects in Switzerland;" "Low German and High German;" "South Germany and the Catholics."

H. C. G. B.

ITALIAN LITERATURE IN BAVARIA.

The relations of Italian literature to the Bavarian court are discussed by Dr. K. von Reinhardtstoettner in the first volume of the *Jahrbuch für Münchener Geschichte*. Material for such a study is furnished abundantly by the accumulations of the Royal Library at Munich, in the shape of librettos, festival compositions, plays, and eulogies of the reigning family written by official court poets, theatrical managers and masters of ceremonies; with occasional sonnets from Italy, celebrating the liberality and enlightenment of the foreign ruler.

Thus there is little of literary value, nor are the poets themselves of wide reputation. The first writer known is Massimo Trojano, a Neapolitan, who describes, in 1568, the festi-

vals which attended the marriage of William V. with Renata of Lorraine. This description, in the form of a dialog, shows that already Italian customs were in fashion—as in France at the same epoch—and that the court pageants were directed by foreigners. Under the rule of William V. and that of his successors, Italians occupied the positions of court orators and poets; from Italy came art and music, and the favors shown their countrymen are reflected in the history of Cesare Campagna, who devotes especial attention to Bavaria, and in the sonnet of Tasso to Maximilian I. while in Italy in 1593. The first half of the XVII. century offers but one document, a description of the Residenz by Baldossare Pistorini; but with the marriage of Ferdinand to Adelaide of Savoy in 1652 begins a period of Italian supremacy. The young queen is accompanied to her northern home by all her southern attendants. The court of Munich becomes an Italian colony. In letters, Adelaide herself set the example by composing madrigals, strambotti and short comedies. To her poets she furnished subjects, inserted in their works portions of her own, collected in Munich much of the Italian literature of the age, and fashioned the court festivals on Italian models. Among those patronized by her may be mentioned her secretary, Domenico Gisberti, a Venetian, writer of sonnets and allegorical plays without number. The rise of the musical drama produced under her care many compositions, among which are found some of Francesco Sbarra, court poet at Vienna, and those of Giovanni Battista Maccioni of Orvieto, who had come to Munich with Adelaide and who is her chosen poetical mouth-piece. Of higher birth is count Pietro Paulo Bissari of Vicenza, who had likewise an Italian reputation, best known at Munich in musical dramas and festival scenes. Another noble is the marquis Ranuccio Pallavicino, attracted from Parma by the fame of the Bavarian court and who in Munich celebrates the architecture of the Residenz and the magnificence of Ferdinand.

After the death of Adelaide, in 1676, Ventura Terzagio, a poet of occasion, writer of musical dramas and festival plays, rivalled Gisberti in the number of his compositions. Later, the wars of Max Emmanuel form the

theme of a poetical album of many authors. A noted librettist is Luigi d'Orlandi from Mantua. Others drew subjects for musical dramas from the works of Corneille and Racine. With the war of the Spanish Succession the glory of the Bavarian court diminished. During the first two decades of the XVIII. century little literary life is found at Munich, but beginning with 1723, when Domenico Lalli (Bastian Biancardi) became court poet and composed at Munich many sonnets, librettos and festival plays, a short-lived revival of Italian influence occurred. Villati and Perozzi, the latter a close imitator of Petrarch, resisted for a time the tide of French tendencies. The Arcadians also are patronized and imitated, while the operas of Zeno and Metastasio hold sway at the theatre. Yet the times were for national development. The rise of German poetry drove out the artificial Italian lyric, and after the middle of the century few traces of other poets than librettists remain.

A bibliography of the period treated in this first article, down to the time of Napoleon, is appended, and is interesting from the number of Italian works published in Munich which it enumerates.

F. M. WARREN.

Johns Hopkins University.

Untersuchungen über den Satzbau Luthers
von DR. HERMANN WUNDERLICH. I
Theil: Die Pronomina. München, 1887.

Those who have written about LUTHER'S language have been concerned for the most part with etymology and with his service to New High German, and have had but little to do with syntax. WETZEL in 'Die Sprache Luthers' (Stuttgart, 1859), and LEHMANN in 'Luthers Sprache in seiner Übersetzung des neuen Testaments' (Halle, 1873), treated of syntax, however, but not from a historical point of view and without tracing out the details. Moreover, almost all the investigations have been confined to the translation of the Bible, while the free course of the development of LUTHER'S language is to be sought in his original writings.

For these reasons DR. WUNDERLICH has opened a broader field for his labors, and, beginning with the address to the German nobility of 1520, which represents the first step

in the development of the *Reformations-schriften*, he comprehends in his researches all the more important writings down to the year 1545. He follows, as in his 'Beiträge zur Syntax Notkers' (Berlin, 1883), the system of MIKLOSICH in considering syntax not a mass of dead rules but a vigorous organism.

This first part is divided into four heads: The simple verbal form;—Pronoun understood from the context;—The personal pronoun;—The demonstrative and relative pronoun. The first three subjects are passed over rather hurriedly, though perhaps sufficient space is given to them, more than half of the entire book being devoted to the demonstratives and relatives. In considering the peculiarities of a writer, the simple sentence is of much less importance than the more complex constructions. We are to look for the characteristics of a writer, in his long periods, where there is opportunity for greater variety of expression. Following this line of argument, our investigator has paid particular attention to the relative sentence and to the position and arrangement of subordinate sentences in general. No vague generalities are given. All statements are illustrated by copious examples, thus making the book a valuable store-house for convenient reference.

A mild protest against the rather monotonous use of abbreviations would, perhaps, not be out of place.

Of course, this book is not 'epoch-making,' but it aims to fill up a gap and, taken, as it does, the language at the period of transition from Middle High German to New High German will be welcomed by scholars who are interested in the study of historical German grammar. It is opportune, as taken in connection with DR. KLUGE's new work on the influence of LUTHER on the German language. We hope the other parts will follow in rapid succession.

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON.

Cornell University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SCANDINAVIAN STUDIES.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Mr. Egge's article in the March num-

ber of MOD. LANG. NOTES on this subject seems to call for some comment on my part; and I shall try to answer his objections and criticisms as briefly as possible. In the first place, I would beg leave to call Mr. Egge's attention to a sentence in my original article that must bar out most of the omissions mentioned by him. The sentence reads as follows: "Only college instruction will be discussed, the purely literary side of the question being necessarily omitted." Now while the University of Minn. must certainly be regarded as a college, one would scarcely include under this head Luther Seminary, Red Wing Sem. and Augsburg Lutheran Seminary and Institute. The Danish High School at Elk Horn and the other schools of Mr. Egge's list may rank very high as schools, but they are not colleges in the Eastern sense of the word, at least. I had not heard, when the article was written, that a college course had been added to St. Olaf's School. Mr. Egge gives us much valuable and interesting information regarding Scandinavian studies in the Western schools, but this can only in part be considered as supplying the omissions of my list.

Again, under the second head, Mr. Egge seems to have misunderstood me. I should not presume to announce that I think that "the study of Icelandic furnishes as good a mental discipline as the study of Greek and Latin," etc. Of course that may be my opinion, but I do not presume to publish it. A reference to my original article will show my statement to be more guarded and conditional; the omission of the little word "if" makes the difference.

Mr. Egge's last criticism may, perhaps, be a just one. My information was obtained almost entirely from the catalogues of the seminaries themselves, and if the impression derived from them be a false one, I should be only too glad to acknowledge my error and to offer my apologies to all offended Scandinavians. If my remarks could be construed as in any way reflecting on the character of our Scandinavian population, I offer here my sincerest apologies. No unprejudiced person can fail to recognize in them one of the mainstays of the republic, and their absence from the Chicago riot is only one proof out of

many of their excellent character and sound common sense. I still claim, however, that it is highly desirable that our foreign population should in all cases become Americanized, though not necessarily at the expense of their native language and literature. A knowledge of English does not preclude a familiarity with Danish or Swedish, nor does an adoption of American ideas shut off all sympathy with home traditions and beliefs.

No one can blame Mr. Egge for his criticisms, since they are evidently made with perfect sincerity. It is always interesting to get a partisan view of any subject. Mr. Egge's intimate acquaintance with the Scandinavian population of the West gives an authority to his statements, to which, of course, I cannot pretend. A residence in the West would without doubt greatly change my views on this subject, but in default of this, I have to rely upon second-hand information, which is apt to be untrustworthy. This letter is not intended at all in an unfriendly spirit, but merely as a justification of my original positions. Mr. Egge's suggestions and his real corrections of my incomplete list are gratefully acknowledged.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

Columbia College.

BRIEF MENTION.

It is gratifying to learn that the Legislature of S. Carolina has doubled the appropriation for South Carolina "College" (now "University") and thereby greatly strengthened her teaching staff. This is one of the most welcome movements in the field of Southern education, where the modern languages at present begin to play so important a rôle. From Oberlin College (Ohio) comes also the cheering news that "the work in the modern language department has increased, necessitating another professor of German."

At the banquet given on the occasion of the reception of the French Professors resident in England, by the University of Cambridge, of which an account was given in the February number of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Dr. Butler, the Master of Trinity College in that University, delivered an address of hearty

welcome in which he warmly endorsed the objects of the society and their efforts to secure the highest competency in the teacher and the best results in the teaching. His speech, which was exceedingly witty and happy, contained several hints of real importance; among others, the necessity of establishing between the foreign teacher and his pupils a warmer sympathy than usually exists. He humourously suggests that "the *entente cordiale* between boys and their foreign masters will never be quite complete till some French master has broken at least a collar-bone at foot-ball."

An attempt to facilitate the study of Old French philology among "candidates to the L. L. A. title of St. Andrew's University" and "students working under the Cambridge University scheme for a tripos in Modern Languages" is made in 'An Introduction to Old French' by F. F. Roget, Graduate of Geneva University, Tutor for comparative Philology, and for the Philology of French, St. George's Hall Classes, Edinburgh (London: Williams and Norgate, 1887; 12mo., pp. 387). Adverse criticism is perhaps scarcely warranted in the case of a work the preface of which begins with the frank avowal: "This book contains no independent research, and little scientific method;" and which proceeds to say, after acknowledging indebtedness to Bartsch's 'Chrestomathie' and Clédât's 'Grammaire élémentaire': "Those books should be resorted to by students who may have a taste for the high scholarship which we cannot offer them in this Introduction." Such a commendation as this, however, betrays a false conception on the part of the present author, since the elementary works here cited, while undoubtedly products, can scarcely be regarded as well-springs, of 'high scholarship'; and in these days no instructor of university candidates should be willing to present his students with a text-book so invertebrate as not to be able even to hold up its head in the presence of such authorities. Indeed, the author strikes with accurate iteration the key-note of his work, in speaking yet again of "our fear that we may be found inaccurate by the learned, and yet abstruse by the learners;" though it is reassuring to find him assuming a

somewhat bolder front in view of the claims of the subject treated, by averring (p. 12) of the earliest monuments, that "they must not be overlooked; true men of learning view them with respect, and even the amateur philologist [Heaven save the mark!] can ill afford to brush aside such an instructive page of the history of language."—The book consists of three parts, of which the first discusses the language of the earliest monuments; the second furnishes a compend of Old French grammar, in which, e. g., *aimer* is accounted a strong verb, and Old French is said to have hardly a syntax of its own; and the third, and most useful, comprises a considerable chrestomathy of prose and verse, with glossary. Notwithstanding the evidences of more than the usual share of well-meaning pains bestowed in the preparation of this volume, its method of treatment is diffuse and many of its views and statements are erroneous. With the exception that the work can scarcely be considered "abstruse by the learners," the verdict of the "critical public, whose judgment a book on Old French studies cannot escape," must in this case be allowed to coincide with the modest professions and apprehensions of its author.

A reprint from the *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* is the article "Vom Descort" by Carl Appel. Derived from the Latin sequences of the Middle Ages, the Descort belongs almost wholly to the flowering period of Provençal literature. Of the twenty-two examples which Dr. Appel notes, the latest is by Guiraut Riquier, dated 1261, and the earliest, which he publishes for the first time, is assigned to Pons de Capduoill († 1189-90) and therefore can be placed in the eighth decade of the twelfth century. The inventor of the Descort is not known with certainty; the biography of Garin d'Apchier asserts that he wrote the first, and cites the opening verses; but the poem itself is lost and the date of the troubadour cannot be exactly determined. As to priority of time between the Descort of North France and that of South France, the advantage rests with the latter. The nine French poems found are later than the earliest dated Provençal, and differ from the latter mainly in length of verse. They are also, fortunately, accom-

panied by musical notation, which is lacking in the Provençal MSS. The Descort does not appear to have flourished outside of France. In Italy three poems of the Sicilian school are noted, more irregular in form than their original and differing from it in content. Certain of the North Italians likewise imitated their neighbors in single poems, the most successful of which is that ascribed to Dante: 'Ai fals ris.' In Spain and Portugal Dr. Appel finds that the Ensalada has little likeness with the Descort, but resembles rather the Frottola and the Fricassée in its mixture of languages and combinations of individual lines taken from different authors. No new definition of the Descort is attempted by the author. He cites the various remarks of the Provençal treatises on poetry, and concludes, with the 'Leys d'Amors,' that the "essential thing in the Descort is the difference of metrical form in the various strophes." A discussion of the relation of the Descort to the lyric Lai of North France—there are but three Lais in Provençal and these imitated from the French—shows that the rimes of the latter change more readily and that the last strophe is like the first, while in the Descort this last strophe is generally represented by a tornada; that, in general, the Descort is subject to more rigid rules than the Lai, a difference explained by the court origin of the former and by the popular origin of the latter; and that the subject of the Descort is love, while that of the earlier Lai is religion. We are led here to differ somewhat from the opinion of Dr. Appel, and to suggest that the origin of the Descort and of the lyric Lai are the same, which would account for the religions bearing of the latter and at the same time explain their essential similarity.

THIERRY'S 'Récits des Temps Mérovingiens' appear to be in favor as a text-book and is found in the Pitt Press Series, edited by G. Masson and A. R. Ropes (Cambridge University Press). The extracts are the same as those of the edition of H. Testard (NOTES III, Col. 218), but the value of the annotations is far below that of the latter. Not only has much less work been expended in preparation—the Appendix, Notes and Indices of the Cambridge edition numbering twenty-nine

pages against fifty-two for the Testard—but also the difficulties of translation and the explanations of customs and laws are passed over superficially. The few attempts at etymologies are not all that could be desired: *masure* “from the L. *maneo*” (p. 116), *merci* “from the L. *merx*, *merces*” (p. 124) give little idea as to how the French form was obtained, while the derivation of Marmontier from *Majus Monasterium* (p. 124) reveals a calm ignorance of phonetic changes. A comparison of the two editions is most useful as illustrative of what editing too often has been, and what, in the hands of a conscientious worker like Testard, it can be made to be. But the same house and the same series offer to themselves a model in an edition of the ‘*École des Femmes*’ by GEORGE SAINTSBURY. This play of Molière, though one of his best, is rarely edited for class work owing no doubt to its occasional coarse allusions. The work of MR. SAINTSBURY is none the less complete and painstaking. Of unusual excellence from the literary standpoint are his Introductions on the life of Molière and on the history of the play. The notes are abundant and designed to initiate into the spirit of the piece as much as to explain constructions. For typographical execution and attractiveness of form and page it is far superior to anything produced as a text-book in France, where it seems to be a tradition that good printing should be excluded from the class-room. The University Press could not do better than to maintain the high standard of editing set in this instance.

The indefatigable “Librairie Hachette & Cie.,” sends us a number of new books for the elementary, or at least the pedagogical, study of modern languages. Brief mention will be made of a few of these:

1. Charlin’s “*First Step*” is only a collection of phrases, well made but within very narrow range, adapted to the illustration, colloquially, of certain forms and idioms in French.

2. Blouët’s “*Primer of French Composition*” by Paul Blouët, late of St. Pauls, is an excellent example of the care which our most scholarly colleagues in the “old country” are devoting to the preparation of the most elementary class-books. The little book of 67

pages gives 40 short stories, well provided with idiomatic notes and an excellent Vocabulary, for translation into French. One of these, with the figures indicating the character of the notes, will suffice to give an idea of the plan—and may be, moreover, not an inappropriate extract for the MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES! “*Two Good Friends*. A journalist one day¹ wrote to David Roberts, the great painter: ‘You have probably² seen³ the articles which I have written⁴ on the pictures which you have exhibited, but I hope that we shall remain friends.’ The painter answered by return of post: ‘The first time that I meet⁶ you, I will pull your⁷ ears, but I hope that we shall remain friends.’”

3. Of like distinguished authorship is “*Common French Words*, rationally grouped as a stepping stone to Conversation and Composition,” by Dr. Al. Beljame and Dr. A. Bossert, with an Introduction by Henri Bué, who tells us that “a book compiled by two such eminent professors can scarcely have a better introduction than the names of its authors.” The book is after the fashion of our well-known “Roget’s Thesaurus of English Words.” Beginning with simple topics, such as “L’homme,” “La maison et la Famille,” “L’École,” etc., and advancing by successive divisions to such as “La Vie Intellectuelle et morale,” “L’Activité Sociale” etc., the authors have grouped together the nouns, adjectives, verbs, etc., most appropriate for conversation or composition on such themes. So far as may be judged by a cursory examination, the work has been done with care and skill. As a book of reference, like Roget’s Thesaurus, it will have interest and value, and may also serve for correction or increase of vocabulary. But if the committing of such lists to memory is relied upon as a “stepping stone to conversation and composition” it will prove, we fear, like all such devices, to be only a broken reed; and the prediction “that it will materially help those who use it in an intelligent manner to speak French with a certain degree of fluency in a comparatively short period” may be taken with a free interpretation of the words “materially,” “intelligent,” “certain,” and “comparatively.” The book is beautifully printed.

4. An edition of Sedaine's "Le Philosophe sans le Savoir," by Victor Oger, Lecturer in University College and Victoria University, is interesting as being the first edition, for English readers, that gives the text of Sedaine's famous plays "as he wrote it and as it is now acted," and also because it gives, as parallel readings, the changes enforced by the "Censine," before it was allowed to be acted in 1765. In the Introduction we have an account of this Censine, and of the subsequent history of the play until it was first acted "integrally" in 1875—after more than a hundred years of repression. To this is added a brief sketch of Sedaine's literary career, and of his contemporary and subsequent reputation, besides a good summary of the play—the introductory matter being, on the whole, a model of what is good for a short edition. But here our commendation must end. To 58 pages, large type, of text, there are exactly 58 pages, small type, of Notes! The editor himself says he has "aimed at evolving from the text all the information in grammar, syntax, idiom, words, phrases, etc., which it suggested." As the result, there is hardly a line that is free from this process of "evolution," and the changes are rung, with almost endless detail and repetition, upon the most elementary points of grammar and vocabulary. The best, then, that can be said for such notes is, they are harmless, for nobody will read them. It is due to the editor to add that he states, by way of explanation of this "excess," that his book is intended—in view of certain examinations—"to be read by school boys and girls knowing hardly anything at all of French . . . , as well as by more advanced students (the Senior Candidates) and by independent readers." It was from the vain effort to produce a book suited at once to all these classes of readers, that the notes have grown into this cumbersome and heterogeneous mass; yet it would be hard to say to which class such an edition is the least adapted.

PERSONAL.

Mr. Greenough White, Professor of Belles-Lettres in the University of the South, at Sewanee (Tenn.), has resigned his position on account of failing health.

Dr. B. F. O'CONNOR (Columbia College, N. Y.) delivered two lectures last month on the "Cycle of Charlemagne," in the Law Building, at Columbia College. PROF. ALCÉE FORTIER (Tulane Univ., New Orleans) has just completed a very successful course of lectures on "Modern French Literature." The authors especially treated were: TH. GAUTIER, MÉRIMÉE and COPPÉE.

MR. C. H. OHLY, an American student who has for many years been pursuing his studies in philology at the Universities of Germany, is about to receive the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Freiburg,

having already gained acceptance for his dissertation: "Die wortstellung bei Otfried; ein beitrage zur deutschen wortstellungslehre." MR. OHLY has so long, under the guidance of the best European teachers, been a zealous student of Germanic philology, that we take pleasure in announcing his intention to return to America to join in our efforts here to establish and maintain the interests of sound and progressive scholarship in 'Modern Language' studies. It is to be hoped that MR. OHLY may soon find a fitting field for work in one of our best colleges.

OBITUARY.

DÉSIRÉ NISARD (JEAN-MARIE-NAPOLÉON) member of the French Academy, former director of the École Normale and senator of France under the Empire, who died at San Remo on the 25th of March, had long passed away from active participation in literary affairs. He was born at Châtillon-sur-Seine the 20th of March 1806, studied at Ste-Barbe, commenced his career in the *Journal des Débats* in 1826, but under the July monarchy, went over to the *National* of Armand Carrel. He early made himself known by opposing the Romantic school, publishing in 1834 *Les Portes latines de la Décadence*, in which he drew a comparison between Lucan and Victor Hugo. Instructor at the École Normale under Guizot and, at the same time, attached to the ministry of Public Instruction, first as chief secretary, later as head of the division of sciences and letters, he entered the field of politics and was deputy of the Côte-d'Or 1842-8. In 1843 he was made professor of Latin Eloquence at the Collège de France, in 1850 elected to the Academy over Alfred de Musset and gave his adhesion to the reign of Napoleon III, who rapidly advanced him. As inspector general of the higher education he took part in the reorganisation of the École Normale, was appointed to succeed Villemain in the chair of French Eloquence at the Sorbonne, which occasioned a political demonstration at his lectures and increased his reputation with the Empire. Commander of the Legion of Honor in 1856, director of the École Normale from 1857, senator of France from 1868, the arrival of the Republic drove him into retirement, and of old age into literary inactivity. His most important works, besides that mentioned above, are: *Précis de la littérature française* (1840); *Histoire de la littérature française* (1849, in two volumes, 1861 in four); collections of separate articles as *Mélanges* (1838), *Études sur la Renaissance* (1855), *Études de critique littéraire* (1858) *Nouvelles Études d'histoire et de littérature* (1864). He also directed the publication of the *Collection des classiques latins* (1839 on, in 27 volumes).

JOURNAL NOTICES.

LITERARISCHES CENTRALBLATT.—No. 6.—Odin, A., Phonologie des patois du canton de Vaud: Etude sur le verbe dans le patois de Blonay (-ier).—No. 8.—Froitzheim, Joh., Lenz, Goethe und Cleophe Fibich.—Harnack, O., Goethe in der Epoche seiner Vollendung (1805-1832). (C).

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES, 1er février.—Brunetière, P., Les Métaphores de Victor Hugo.

REVUE POLITIQUE ET LITTÉRAIRE.—No. 6.—Dar-mesteter, J., Miss Robinson; the Plan of Campaign.—No. 7.—Larroumet, G., Shakespeare et le théâtre français.—No. 8.—Berr, H., L'histoire des romans de M. Alphonse Daudet.

REVUE DU MONDE LATIN.—Février.—Lefebvre-St-Ogan, La société italienne de la Renaissance.

NUOVA ANTOLOGIA.—FASO. II.—D'Ovidio, F., Sulla canzone "Chiare, fresche e dolci acque".—FASO. III. Martini, Ferd., Francillon.

FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.—March.—Dowden, E., The Study of English Literature.—James, H., Guy de Maupassant.

ANDOVER REVIEW.—March.—Dawes, A. L., F. W. H. Myers, poet and critic.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW.—March.—Hans Sachs.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DEN DEUTSCHEN UNTER-
RICHT, II, 2.—Schoenfeld, P., Accent und Quantität.—Mühlhausen, Aug., Vom Übersetzen in der Schule.—Maydorn, B., Zur Aussprache des Deutschen in der Schule.

IL PROPUGNATORE—Novembre-Dicembre, 1887.—Con-cato, Salvatore.—Il sonetto rinterzato "Quando il consiglio degli uccel si tenne" di Dante Alighieri.—Pagano, Vincenzo, Galeazzo di Tarsia, notizie storiche e letterarie del barone e poeta Galeazzo di Tarsia.—Giovanni Re di Sassonia, (Filiale)—Comento della Divina Commedia per la prima volta tradotto.—Lamma, Ernesto, Di alcuni Petrarchisti del secolo XV.—Restori, Antonio, Osservazioni sul metro, sulle assonanze e sul testo del Poema del Cid (continua-zione e fine).—Galter, Bibliografie.

REVUE DES PATOIS, No. 3.—Juillet-Octobre 1887.—Cledat, L., Le patois de Coligny et de Saint-Amour. Grammaire et glossaire.—Comblat, Contes en patois de Germolles. Jean de la Jeanne. Le loup et le renard. Le couvent de Cluny. Peton et sa femme. Les coups d'yeux.—Puitspelu, Sur une dérivation populaire du participe passé.—Sebillot, P., Contes de la Haute-Bretagne: La bonne femme aux cent écus. Peuçot.—Devanne, Conte en patois de Prouvy. Laisse-là ma tête.—Blanchet, Proverbes limousins.—Possoz, Chan-son en patois de Sâez (Savoie). Les trois sortes de garçons.—Depouillement des périodiques français consacrés aux traditions populaires.—Notices biblio-graphiques.—Chronique.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR NEUFRAZÖSISCHE SPRACHE
UND LITTERATUR, BAND X., HEFT I.—(Abhandlung-
en).—Bicken, W., Die Gestaltung des französischen
Unterrichts in Übereinstimmung mit den revidierten
Lehrplänen.—Bock, N., Molière's Amphitryon im

Verhältnis zu seinen Vorgängern.—Miscellen. Banzer, D., Die Frau Patelin und ihre Nachahmungen.—(Sup-
plementheft 4).—Holzhausen, P., Die Lustspiele Vol-
taires.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN. VOL. XI. PART 2.—Ka-luza, M., Zum handschriftenverhältniss und zur text-
kritik des Cursor Mundi.—Klinghardt, H., Australisch-
er volkscharacter.—Reviews: Körting, G., Grundriss
der geschichte der englischen literatur von ihren
anfängen bis zur gegenwart (E. Kölbing).—Körner,
K., Einleitung in das studium des Angelsächsis. Erster
theil, zweite aufl. bearbeitet von Adolf Socin (E.
Nader).—Sweet, H., Second Middle English Primer (J.
Koch).—Wright, W. Aldis, The Bible Word-Book (A.
L. Mayhew).—Garnett, Richard, Works on Carlyle:—
Oswald, Eugene, Life of Thomas Carlyle;—Flügel,
Ewald, Thomas Carlyle. Ein lebensbild und gold-
körner aus seinen werken;—Fischer, Th. A., Erin-
nerungen an Jane Welsh Carlyle (M. Krummacher).—
Mommson, Tycho, Die Kunst des übersetzens fremd-
sprachlicher dichtungen ins Deutsche (Max Koch).—
Baudisch, Julius, Ueber die charaktere im 'Bruce'
des altschottischen dichters John Barbour (E. Köl-
bing).—Soffe, Emil, Ist Mucedorus ein schauspiel
Shakespeares? (L. Prüscholdt).—Johann Baudisch,
Schulcommentar zu Milton's Paradise Lost (M. Krum-
macher).—A number of English 'Readers' for Ger-
man Schools and several school-grammars, are
noticed.—Victor, W., Elemente der phonetik, etc.,
Zweite auflage (A. Western).—Sweet, H., Elementar-
buch des gesprochenen English. Zweite Auflage (H.
Klinghardt).—Wagner, Ph., Die sprachlaute des Eng-
lischen (Franz Beyer).—Phonetische Studien, Hrsg. v.
W. Vietor (H. Klinghardt).—Several works on
'Methods' of teaching Modern Languages are re-
viewed.—Wendt, G., Der gebrauch des bestimmten
artikels im Englischen (E. Nader).—Krummacher, M.,
Metrische übersetzungen (L. Prüscholdt).—Miscellen:
Elze, K., Falsche versabtheilung bei Shakespeare.—
Lentzner, K., Coco und cocoa; Alexander Schmidt
(necrology by Karl Lentzer).

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ROMANISCHE PHILOLOGIE, XI,
3.—Teza, E., Trifoglio.—Thurneysen, R., Der Weg vom
dactylischen Hexameter zum epischen Zehnsilber der
Franzosen.—Osterhage, G., Anklänge an die germa-
nische Mythologie in der altfranzösischen Karissage.
III.—Andresen, H., Zu Benott's Chronique des ducs
de Normandie.—Gröber, G., Zu den Liederbüchern
von Cortona.—Vermischtes.—Reinhardtstötner, v., La
Vittoria di Christiani des Giovanni Bonasera.—Hor-
ning, A., Über steigende und fallende Diphthonge im
Ostfranzösischen.—Dias, Epiph., Über die spanischen
laute ç, z und j.—Ulrich, J., Etymologisches.—Be-
sprechungen.—Tobler, A.: H. Michelant, Der Roman
von Escanor von Gerard von Amiens.—Tobler, A.,
Romania, XVIIe année, 1887. Janvier.—Stengel, E., A.
Tobler, Berichtigung.

ARCHIVIO GLOTTOLOGICO ITALIANO, X, 2.—
Fischia, G., Annotazioni sistematiche alle Antiche
rime genovesi ecc.—Cecl, L., Vocalismo del dialetto
d'Alatri.—Tobler, A., Il Panfilo in antico veneziano,
col latino a fronte, edito e illustrato.—Ascoli, G. I.,
Di -tr-essa che prenda il posto di -tr-eca, i.—Il tipo
gallo-romano seur-sebò e i franc. ortel e glaive dello
stesso.—Gaster, M., Il Physiologus rumeno, edito e
illustrato.